TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.



THE JUBILEE ADDRESS OF TH



ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

1897.

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

New Series.

VOL. XI.

465679
6.9.47

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY.
1897.

The Society as a body is not responsible for the opinions advanced in the following pages.

DA
20
R9
n.s.
v. 11

CONTENTS

PAGE

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS. By the RIGHT HON. SIR MOUNTSTUART E. GRANT DUFF, G.C.S.I., PRESIDENT . . . 1

A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW HISTORICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY. By FREDERIC HARRISON 19

THE ÉCOLE DES CHARTES AND ENGLISH RECORDS. By PROFESSOR F. YORK POWELL 31

SOME SURVIVORS OF THE ARMADA IN IRELAND. By MAJOR MARTIN A. S. HUME 41

ELIZABETHAN VILLAGE SURVEYS. By W. J. CORBETT, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. 67

ON SOME POLITICAL THEORIES OF THE EARLY JESUITS. By J. NEVILLE FIGGIS, M.A. 89

A NARRATIVE OF THE PURSUIT OF ENGLISH REFUGEES IN GERMANY UNDER QUEEN MARY. By I. S. LEADAM, M.A. 113

THE CONFERENCE OF PILLNITZ. By OSCAR BROWNING, M.A., V.P. R.Hist.S. 133

GOREE: A LOST POSSESSION OF ENGLAND. By WALTER FREWEN LORD 139

INDEX 153

CHARTER OF INCORPORATION 165

BYE-LAWS 171

LIST OF FELLOWS 185

ILLUSTRATIONS

THE JUBILEE ADDRESS OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY . . . . . *Frontispiece*

PLAN OF THE MANOR OF HORSTEAD AND STANINGHALL, NORFOLK . . . . . *To face p.* 70

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

By the Right Honble. Sir MOUNTSTUART E. GRANT DUFF, G.C.S.I., President

In previous Addresses I have spoken of Thucydides, Tacitus, Herodotus, and Aristotle, with special reference to the amount of light to be gained from their writings by the modern statesman. To-day I propose to take for my subject a far less famous personage, but one who should certainly not be passed over without some notice, by anybody who is interested in the contributions made by the ancient world to political thought.

Polybius—for it is to him that I allude—has been in several respects very unfortunate. In the first place, of his large and carefully ordered work only five books have come down in a complete or pretty complete form; while large portions of it have been preserved in the shape of fragments, to be pieced together by able editors as best they can. It might have been better in some ways for his fame, if only the five books had been preserved; for although his work was, as I have said, *carefully* ordered, it was not exactly *well ordered.* His elaborately thought-out plan was not a very happy one, but lent itself to a certain amount of confusion; which confusion, thanks to the fragmentary state in which many of his writings have been transmitted to us, has become confusion worse confounded. In the second place, his style is by no

means brilliant. He says what he has got to say in a straightforward, soldierly fashion, but his style is lumbering and has assuredly no charm. He knew this himself, and said (Book xvi. chapter 17):

'To my mind it is quite right to take great care and pay great attention to the presentation of one's facts in correct and adequate language, for this contributes in no small degree to the effectiveness of history; still I do not think that serious writers should regard it as their primary and most important object. Far from it. Quite other are the parts of his history on which a practical politician should rather pride himself.'

In the third place, many of the subjects which he treats are profoundly uninteresting to the modern reader. The virtues of the Arcadians, the vices of the Ætolians leave me at least entirely unmoved; and I feel very little interest in any of his narratives, save those which relate to the conquering march of Rome.

In the fourth place, he is not unfrequently too didactic, too determined that the reader shall not only taste, but devour and digest every morsel of the moral which he presents for his consumption.

These are, I think, the chief reservations which we must enumerate, if we wish to do neither more nor less than justice to Polybius. These made, however, we may, I think, say that he was a very worthy and a very wise man.

It should be remembered, too, that although Polybius is little read now, he has had great influence at different periods of the world's history. Cicero had evidently studied him with great care, and it is very probable that if Polybius had not led the way, neither what has been described as the golden observations of Machiavelli upon Livy, nor Montesquieu's study of the greatness and decadence of the Romans would ever have been written. Barthélemy St.-Hilaire blames Descartes for having declined to write about politics because he had not lived the life of a politician. That philosopher thought that for one, situated as he was, to dogmatise about affairs in which he had never taken part was hardly consistent

with the profession of a lover of wisdom. Surely he was right; and surely Polybius was right too, when he declined to occupy himself with a constitution which had never been tried in practice.

In the forty-seventh chapter of his sixth Book he says:

'It would not be fair to introduce the Republic of Plato, which is spoken of in high terms by some philosophers. For just as we refuse admission to the athletic contests of those actors or athletes who have not acquired a recognised position or trained for them, so we ought not to admit this Platonic constitution to the contest for the prize of merit, unless it can first point to some genuine and practical achievement. Up to this time the notion of bringing it into comparison with the constitutions of Sparta, Rome, and Carthage would be like putting up a statue to compare with living and breathing men. Even if such a statue were faultless in point of art; the comparison of the lifeless with the living would naturally leave an impression of imperfection and incongruity upon the minds of the spectators.'

Wise as he is, Polybius is pre-eminently one of those ancient writers who should be read only in judiciously selected extracts. A volume of these has been compiled by Mr. Strachan Davidson, of Balliol College, an institution where this too much neglected writer has perhaps received more honour than in most other places, and a very moderate percentage of these would no doubt satisfy the needs of the majority of readers.

I remember that one of the lectures into which I was put, at Balliol, nearly fifty years ago, was on Polybius, and the part which had been chosen was amongst the most interesting portions of his writings, the struggle of the Romans with Hamilcar Barca in and around what is now known as the Golden Shell of Palermo. Very grateful I was to Mr. Edward Woollcombe, the tutor who presided over this particular lecture, when just after leaving Oxford I found myself in Sicily. In 1889 Mr. Shuckburgh published a valuable translation of what is now, I believe, held to be the most

satisfactory text, that of Hultzsch, and it is from it that I shall take the extracts I propose to read in illustration of what I have to say. I have myself used only the text of Bekker.

The first thing which strikes a reader of Polybius is his curious modernness. His mind was assuredly not a more powerful one than that of Thucydides; but there was endless discussion about history and its uses, between the days of the older and the younger author. The world had immensely widened on his view. His horizon was not bounded by the narrow limits of Greece and her colonies; but extended over all the three basins of the middle sea, far into Asia, and over wide regions both of Europe and Africa with which Greece and Greek civilisation had but little or nothing to do. On many subjects he took a much more sensible view than was at all common until quite recent times—nay, a more sensible view than that which we often hear, even from the mouths of fairly intelligent persons amongst our contemporaries.

Thus in Book iv. chapter 74, speaking of the people of Elis, he says:

'For peace is a thing we all desire, and are willing to submit to anything to obtain: it is the only one of our so-called blessings that no one questions'; and in the same Book, chapter 31, speaking of the Messenians, he supplies just what is wanted to qualify the rather too sweeping language of that passage:

'I admit, indeed, that war is a terrible thing; but it is less terrible than to submit to anything whatever in order to avoid it. For what is the meaning of our fine talk about equality of rights, freedom of speech, and liberty if the one important thing is peace? We have no good word for the Thebans, because they shrank from fighting for Greece and chose from fear to side with the Persians—nor indeed for Pindar, who supported their inaction in the verses—

> A quiet haven for the ship of state
> Should be the patriot's aim,
> And smiling peace, to small and great
> That brings no shame.

For though his advice was for the moment acceptable, it was not long before it became manifest that his opinion was as mischievous as it was dishonourable. For peace, with justice and honour, is the noblest and most advantageous thing in the world; when joined with disgrace and contemptible cowardice, it is the basest and most disastrous.'

In short, we may, I think, set down Polybius not as a peace-at-any-price man, nor as a man who acquiesced in or even welcomed war on account of the incidental advantages which it sometimes brings, but as a peace-almost-at-any-price man, which is what I consider everyone ought to be.

Observe in the last passage the phrase 'Peace with honour,' which became so famous in our own times, and was, I daresay, believed by many to have been invented by the eminent person who used it; just as was the case with his almost equally famous '*Sanitas sanitatum, omnia sanitas*,' which is to be found in 'Menagiana,' a book of the seventeenth century. Was the story, by the way, true, or only happily invented, that on one occasion when Lord Beaconsfield and his Foreign Secretary appeared together in a transparency, beneath which blazed the words 'Peace with Honour,' an old woman in the crowd said to her neighbour, 'Would you please, Sir, tell me which is Peace'? Peace having been a gentleman, as some of you will remember, famous in the criminal annals of that period.

Again, what could be better than the remark of our author in Book v. chap. 2?

'For the purpose with which good men wage war is not the destruction and annihilation of the wrongdoers, but the reformation and alteration of the wrongful acts. Nor is it their object to involve the innocent in the destruction of the guilty, but rather to see that those who are held to be guilty should share in the preservation and elevation of the guiltless.'

Now let us turn to some of his views about history. In Book ii. chap. 56 he says:

'Surely an historian's object should not be to amaze his

readers by a series of thrilling anecdotes ; nor should he aim at producing speeches which might have been delivered, nor study dramatic propriety in details, like a writer of tragedy ; but his function is above all to record with fidelity what was actually said or done, however commonplace it may be.'

Contrast this with the following delightfully naïve passage from an early work of an historian lately taken from us. I find it in Mr. Froude's 'Life of St. Neot,' in the second volume of the 'Lives of the English Saints.'

'We all write Legends. Little as we may be conscious of it, we all of us continually act on the very same principle which made the Lives of Saints such as we find them ; only perhaps less poetically.

'Who has not observed in himself, in his ordinary dealings with the facts of every-day life, with the sayings and doings of his acquaintance, in short, with everything which comes before him as a *fact*, a disposition to forget the real order in which they appear, and re-arrange them according to his theory of how they ought to be? Do we hear of a generous, self-denying action, in a short time the real doer and it are forgotten ; it has become the property of the noblest person we know ; so a jest we relate of the wittiest person, frivolity of the most frivolous, and so on ; each particular act we attribute to the person we conceive most likely to have been the author of it. And this does not arise from any wish to leave a false impression, scarcely from carelessness ; but only because facts refuse to remain bare and isolated in our memory ; they will arrange themselves under some law or other ; they must illustrate something to us—some character—some principle—or else we forget them. Facts are thus perpetually, so to say, becoming unfixed and re-arranged in a more conceptional order.'

Polybius would assuredly have shuddered as he read this astounding passage. Yet he was very far from thinking that a bare statement, even of true facts—let alone of imaginary ones—was enough ; for in Book iii. chap. 31 he says :

'Neither the writer nor the reader of history, therefore,

should confine his attention to a bare statement of facts; he must take into account all that preceded or followed them. For if you take from history all explanation of cause, principle, and motive, and of the adaptation of the means to the end, what is left is a mere panorama without being instructive; and, though it may please for the moment, has no abiding value.'

And again, in Book vi. chap. 1, he adds:

'What is really educational and beneficial to students of history is the clear view of the causes of events, and the consequent power of choosing the better policy in a particular case.'

Could Professor Seeley have put it better?

Here again is a passage, in which he anticipates the views of a well-known modern historian (I mean Mr. Buckle):

'For we mortals have an irresistible tendency to yield to climatic influences; and to this cause, and no other, may be traced the great distinctions which prevail amongst us in character, physical formation, and complexion, as well as in most of our habits, varying with nationality or wide local separation.'

Polybius had no sympathy with the habit, consecrated by the practice of many illustrious persons, of inventing speeches. In Book xii. chap. 25 he says:

'The historian therefore who omits the words actually used, as well as all statement of the determining circumstances, and gives us instead conjectures and mere fancy compositions, destroys the special use of history. In this respect Timæus is an eminent offender, for we all know that his books are full of such writing.'

He deserves the greatest possible credit for having seen more clearly than most writers, ancient or modern, the immense importance of Geography. We may compare him in this respect with Dr. Arnold in our times, or with his pupil Dean Stanley.

I am afraid that Dr. Arnold would not have considered this observation very complimentary; for he disparages

Polybius, as a geographer, in his 'History of Rome.' I am sure, however, that Polybius had the root of the matter in him, and that if he had had anything like the same facilities as those which his critic enjoyed from books, maps, plans, and opportunities of travel, he would have shown himself at least the equal of his successor.

'The science of genuine history,' he remarks, 'is threefold: first, the dealing with written documents and the arrangement of the material thus obtained. Second, topography, the appearance of cities and localities, the description of rivers and harbours, and, speaking generally, the peculiar features of seas and countries and their relative distances. Thirdly, political affairs.'

A great many of his miscellaneous remarks are extremely shrewd. Here, for example, is one with reference to the extraordinary effect which the Lacedæmonian Xanthippus had in restoring the fortunes of the Carthaginians, after their first defeats by Regulus. It will be found in Book i. chap. 35.

'Again we are taught the truth of that saying of Euripides: "One wise man's skill is worth a world in arms. For it was one man, one brain that defeated the numbers which were believed to be invincible and able to accomplish anything; and restored to confidence a whole city that was unmistakably and utterly ruined, and the spirits of its army which had sunk to the lowest depths of despair.'

The actual words used by Polybius, in referring to Euripides, are:

'Ἓν σοφὸν βούλευμα τὰς πολλὰς χεῖρας νικᾷ'

an impossible line, of course.

Mr. Shuckburgh gives the idea quite correctly; but I should have preferred the more literal prose rendering: 'One wise counsel prevails over many hands'; reminding one of the equally true words, 'Dix mille ignorances ne font pas un savoir.'

If there ever was a time when the doctrine of the

supreme importance of the individual brain had to be brought prominently forward, it is that in which we live, when the multitude is told, by some of the people to whom it likes to listen, that the highest ability required for the most difficult duties can be bought for 500*l.* a year.

Polybius returns to the same thought in Book x. chap. 32 :

'For what is the use of a commander or general, who has not learnt that the leader ought to keep as far as possible aloof from those minor operations in which the whole fortune of the campaign is not involved? Or of one who does not know that even if circumstances should at times force them to engage in such subordinate movements, the commanders-in-chief should not expose themselves to danger until a large number of their company have fallen? For, as the proverb has it, the experiment should be made "on the worthless Carian," not on the General. For to say, "I shouldn't have thought it,"—"Who would have expected it?" seems to me the clearest proof of strategical incompetence and dulness.'

Take another specimen of our historian's sagacity in Book v. chap. 31 :

'"Well begun is half done" was meant by its inventors to urge the importance of taking the greater pains to make a good beginning than anything else. And though some may consider this an exaggeration, in my opinion it comes short of the truth ; for one might say with confidence, not that "the beginning was half the business," but rather that it was near being the whole.'

Here is a third in Book ii. chapter 47 :

'He satisfied himself that Antigonus was a man of activity and practical ability, with some pretensions to the character of a man of honour ; he, however, knew perfectly well that kings look on no man as a friend or foe from personal considerations, but ever measure friendships and enmities solely by the standard of expediency.'

We shall find a fourth in Book iv. chapter 8 :

'Not only is it the case that the same man has an aptitude for one class of activities and not for another; it often happens that in things closely analogous the same man will be exceedingly acute and exceedingly dull, exceedingly courageous and exceedingly timid. Nor is this a paradox; it is a very ordinary fact, well known to all attentive observers.'

In chapter 16 of the same book we read:

'But though the conduct of the Ætolians caused them momentary indignation, they were not excessively moved by it, because it was no more than what the Ætolians habitually did. Their anger, therefore, was short-lived, and they presently voted against going to war with them. So true is it that an habitual course of wrong-doing finds readier pardon than when it is spasmodic or isolated.'

The following is from a fragment, placed by Mr. Shuckburgh at the end of Book xx.:

'To see an operation with one's own eyes is not like merely hearing a description of it. It is, indeed, quite another thing; and the confidence which such vivid experience gives is always greatly advantageous.'

I remember the same idea being put more epigrammatically by the Maharajah of Cashmere, who said to me at Jummoo in 1875: 'Between the ear and the eye there are only two or three fingers' breadth; but there is a mighty difference between hearing and seeing.'

Very interesting is this reflection on the death of his hero Philopœmen in Book xxii. chapter 12. That remarkable and nearly up to the close of his life most fortunate man was captured and murdered by Messenians. His warm admirer says:

'It was, I suppose, a case of the common proverb, "A man may have a stroke of luck, but no man can be lucky always." We must therefore call our predecessors fortunate, without pretending that they were so invariably, for what need is there to flatter Fortune by a meaningless and false compliment? It is those who have enjoyed Fortune's smiles in their life for the longest time, and who, when

she changes her mind, meet with only moderate mishaps, that we must speak of as fortunate.'

How wise again is the observation in Book xvi. chapter 8:

'I was induced to make these remarks, because I observed that some men, like bad runners in the stadium, abandon their purposes when close to the goal, while it is at that particular point, more than at any other, that others secure the victory over their rivals.'

These words may recall to us the first Lord Lytton's fine lines on an English Parliamentary career. He is speaking of the failure in the House of Commons of Mackworth Praed:

> 'Yet in St. Stephen's this bright creature failed.
> Yes, but o'er failure had he not prevailed,
> If his that scope in time which victory needs.
> Fame is a race, he who runs on succeeds.
> True in all contests, in the Senate's most,
> There but small way till half a life is lost.'

The outlook of Polybius on the world was too wide to make him a devotee of mere municipal patriotism. In Book xviii. chapter 14, he says:

'The man who measures everything by the interests of his own particular state, and imagines that all the Greeks ought to have their eyes fixed upon Athens, on the pain of being styled traitors, seems to me to be ill-informed, and to be labouring under a strange delusion.

'For what did the Athenians eventually get by their opposition to Philip? Why, the crowning disaster of the defeat at Chæronea. And had it not been for the king's magnanimity and regard for his own reputation, their misfortunes would have gone even further, thanks to the policy of Demosthenes.'

I wish the moderns had not followed the bad example which Polybius reprobates in this passage. Half the mistakes that have been made about Greece in this century have arisen from the fact that the West has reasoned from a brief period

in the history of Athens, when it was splendid alike in arts, literature, and arms. The poets of the nineteenth century invented a purely imaginary Greece, as Fuad Pasha or someone writing under his name so truly observed in that noble paper which he is said to have addressed on his death-bed to the Sultan, and which, given to the world by the *Revue de Paris*, has not, I venture to think, excited the attention which it deserves.

Infinite political mischief has been done by the habit of confining our attention to one fragment of old Hellenic history. To know what Greeks were and are, we should read their story in its outlines through all the ages. Then, perhaps too many misguided persons in France, England, and Germany would not have listened to the promises of M. Tricoupi, because Aristides was called 'the Just.'

Polybius knew his countrymen as well even as Herodotus. Look for example at the passage in Book xxxii. chapter 8, in which he contrasts the disinterestedness of Æmilius Paulus with that of the Greeks who stood most in repute for that virtue:

'If,' he says, 'to abstain from appropriating money entrusted to a man for the benefit of the depositor deserves our admiration, as is *said* to have happened in the case of the Athenian Aristides and the Theban Epaminondas, how much more admirable is it to be master of a kingdom and yet to have coveted nothing in it!'

I would that he could give some advice to the Cabinets of Europe at this moment.

Not unfrequently Polybius would seem to be writing about events of our own day. Very interesting for example are his reflections on the end of the Celtic War in B.C. 222, and they have a bearing not only on the behaviour of Celtic tribes in the field, but may well be taken account of by those who have to deal with them in civil life.

'The Gauls showed no power of planning or carrying out a campaign, and in everything they did were swayed by impulse rather than by sober calculation. As I have seen these tribes, after a short struggle, entirely ejected from the

Valley of the Padus, with the exception of some few localities lying close to the Alps, I thought I ought not to let their original attack upon Italy pass unrecorded, any more than their subsequent attempts, or their final ejectment; for it is the function of the historian to record and transmit to posterity such episodes in the drama of Fortune; that our posterity may not from ignorance of the past be unreasonably dismayed at the sudden and unexpected invasions of these barbarians, but may reflect how short-lived and easily damped the spirit of this race is; and so may stand to their defence.'

The hordes who streamed southward into Italy or Greece were bad people to run away from.

Here again, in Book i. chapter 67, is a remark used with reference to the mutiny of the Carthaginian mercenaries, which might have been penned in India in 1857:

'Armies in such a state are not usually content with mere human wickedness. They end by assuming the ferocity of wild beasts and the vindictiveness of insanity.'

The following in Book xxiv. chapter 4 might be an extract from the Review of 1896 in the *Times*:—

'In Crete there was the beginning of great troubles set in motion, if one should speak of "a beginning of troubles" in Crete; for owing to the persistency of Civil Wars and the acts of savagery practised against each other, beginning and end are much the same in Crete; and what appears to some people to be an incredible story is a spectacle of everyday occurrence there.'

I commend this passage to those who feel themselves able to be very enthusiastic about the Cretans. Even in what are supposed to have been the virtuous ages of Greece they were described by their neighbours in an hexameter line which became known in Christendom by being quoted in Titus i. 12. Is there the slightest reason to imagine that they have improved in any degree since then, or that, if the distinction between Mussulman and Christian did not supply them with a motive for cutting each other's throats, they would not find some other?

The following words from Book ii. chapter 20 might have been written of France, in the end of the last and the beginning of the present century :—

'For at this period Fortune seems to have plagued the Gauls with a kind of epidemic of war.'

On one point Polybius has very directly and very powerfully influenced the modern world, for it was he, to the best of my belief, who first set forth, in detail and with reasons, the importance of Constantinople. His views on this subject are given in Book iv. chapter 38 and the following chapters. He begins by saying that :—

'As far as the sea is concerned, Byzantium occupies a position the most secure and in every way the most advantageous of any town in our quarter of the world : while in regard to the land, its situation is in both respects the most unfavourable.'

He then points out that Byzantium so completely commands the entrance to the Pontus, that no merchant can sail in or out against its will ; adding that, the Pontus being rich in what all the rest of the world requires for the staff of life, the Byzantines are absolute masters of all such things—as for instance cattle, slaves, honey, wax, and salt fish ; in exchange for which the Greeks sent them oil and wine, while they sometimes exported corn, and sometimes imported it.

Next follows a long account of the Pontus, and a curious prophecy (which has been falsified by events) that it would be gradually filled up by the alluvium of the Danube and other rivers. This is succeeded by a description of the currents which 'lash and lave Europe and Asia,' ending thus :—

'A current runs from the place on the Asiatic side called the Cow, the place on which the myth declares Io to have first stood after swimming the channel. From there it runs right up to Byzantium, and, dividing into two streams on either side of the city, the lesser part of it forms the gulf called the Horn, while the greater part swerves once more across. But it has no longer sufficient way on it to reach the

opposite shore on which Calchedon stands; for, after its several counter-blows, the current, finding at this point a wider channel, slackens; and no longer makes short rebounds at right angles from one shore to the other, but more and more at an obtuse angle, and accordingly, falling short of Calchedon, runs down the middle of the channel.

'What then makes Byzantium a most excellent site, and Calchedon the reverse, is just this; and although at first sight both positions seem equally convenient, the practical fact is that it is difficult to sail up to the latter, even if you wish to do so; while the current carries you to the former, whether you will or no, as I have just now shown.'

Steam has long since destroyed the importance of the currents on which Polybius so much dwells, and the Thracians plus the Gauls, whose near neighbourhood made, in his view, its position so unfavourable by land, have long since vanished into space; but we are still constantly occupied with thoughts about its admirable maritime position and its relation to various neighbours at least as dangerous as ever was Gaul or Thracian.

How much of our preoccupations are reasonable, and how much merely inherited, I will not now inquire; but surely Polybius did much to turn men's thoughts in this direction.

He not only came to wise conclusions about the world around him, and about past events; he looked forward with very clear eyes into the future. Devoted as he was to the Roman Constitution, personally attached as he was to many Romans of distinction—more especially to the family of the Scipios—he had no illusions about the seeds of mischief in the Great Republic. He foresaw the days of Marius and Sulla, nay he even had the vision of the Cæsarian power, under which the terrified and distracted citizens would eventually have to take refuge.

He has been accused by some of not being impartial. I should say that, considering all things, he was *very* impartial—quite as impartial as most historians who have a real

interest in the subject about which they write. One might as soon have expected a French soldier, who had fought through Napoleon's campaigns, to write impartially of the conduct of England during the great war, as to find Polybius speaking well of the mortal foes of his native Arcadia and of the Achæan league. That such a lover of Rome should be so fair to Hannibal is infinitely to his credit. He is often severe in censuring other historians, but they probably richly deserved the censure; and he was quite willing to be censured for faults similar to those which he reproves in them. There is an interesting passage in Book xvi. chapter 20, which shows his way of looking at honest criticism—not the mere criticism of private spite:

'When Zeno received my letter, and found that it was impossible to make the correction, because his history was already published, he was much vexed but could do nothing. He, however, put the most friendly interpretation on my proceeding; and in regard to this point, I would beg my own readers, whether of my own or future generations, if I am ever detected in making a deliberate misstatement, and disregarding truth in any part of my history, to criticise me unmercifully, but if I do so from lack of information, to make allowances; and I ask it for myself more than others, owing to the size of my history and the extent of ground covered by its transactions.'

I might quote a great many more passages illustrating my point, but I think I have quoted enough to show that Polybius deserves more attention than he receives. I do not think there can be a doubt—and it is an opinion which I have frequently expressed—that before long there must be a complete revision of our system of classical studies. It has been shorn of a good many nonsensical excrescences in the last thirty years, and change is still proceeding in some of the more backward regions. Probably no man at the head of a great school would now venture to say, what a person in that position did say to me thirty-six years ago, that he did not teach Greek on account of any-

thing that was to be read in it, but simply on account of its difficulty. Still there is an immense deal to be done both in proscribing and prescribing, in decreeing what it is unnecessary for young scholars to read, and what they ought not to omit. When everyone gets their rights, I think a little of Polybius will be insisted on, and that those who read some well-chosen passages of his works will, if the accidents of life give them the management of public affairs, have not unfrequently occasion to remember judicious observations made or wise counsels given by him.

A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW HISTORICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

By FREDERIC HARRISON

Read November 19, 1896

THE proposed amalgamation of the Royal Historical Society with the Camden Society, from which we hope to see many advantages to both, has led me to submit for consideration a scheme in which both societies might collaborate for the preparation of a competent Bibliography of English History. All students are aware how singularly deficient is our literature in the department of historical bibliography. France and Germany have now been working in this field with great industry, and more or less success, for more than a century. They have shown us many *lacunæ* and not a few errors to avoid ; and we may now, at any rate, perceive what schemes are impracticable and what are useless. England, which has with such energy, and I venture to think with such signal success, laboured on a series of exhaustive Calendars of her Manuscript authorities, has been curiously slow to set about a scientific bibliography of the published materials of her own history.

I am quite aware that this is a question essentially for experts, and as I have not the smallest pretension to be an expert in bibliography, it is with much diffidence that I venture to ask the attention of those before me, so many of whom are far more competent to discuss the problem than I can pretend to be. But my purpose is not at all to dogmatise, or to impose any hard and fast scheme for acceptance. I shall seek only to open a discussion, to invite suggestions,

and to call attention to some of the conditions of the problem, and the difficulties with which various earlier attempts have been met.

To put my proposal into a summary form it is this. The task is to form, to sketch the plan, or perhaps to commence, a systematic survey of the printed authorities for English history. For reasons that I shall explain, the scheme would not include Manuscript documents; for these obviously stand on a totally different footing, and for these so much has already been done. The scheme would be limited to English history, a field quite vast enough in itself, for which so little has yet been done by English bibliographers. But it would not be limited to English authorities. The task would obviously be divided into chronological epochs; and might be limited at first to a definite period. It must have, in my opinion, at least two departments: one being subdivided into subjects as heads of parts; another being subdivided into chronological epochs. I shall discuss whether any, and what, other departments are desirable. I shall propose that this be not a mere catalogue of books or of authors' names; but a brief analysis of contents and a careful estimate of value and importance, succinctly stated and so as not to trench on the province of criticism.

It seems to me obvious that a work of this kind, if it is to be really thorough and exhaustive, should not be attempted by any one person. And it is not very likely to prove a success if any one person were bold enough to attempt it. It is eminently the work for a combination of specialists labouring on a common type, just as the 'Dictionary of National Biography' or the 'New English Dictionary' of Dr. Murray. Like either of these works it could be prepared and issued in sections; and a number of collaborators could divide amongst themselves sections large or small, when once a satisfactory type had been approved and a competent direction secured. The Royal Historical Society and the Camden Society count in their ranks a considerable number of students amply equipped to take part in such a work. Few of them perhaps

would feel equal to the labour of completing the task as a whole, or any very large proportion of it, even if they felt equal to bring to the whole the requisite learning and knowledge. But every serious historical student could with moderate labour make his contribution to an adequate bibliography of his own field of study. It is a kind of publication particularly suited to the periodical issue of historical studies which has so long been the business of these two societies, now happily about to unite their forces. Lastly, there is another facility of the same kind of no small importance. An exhaustive Bibliography, like the catalogue of a national Library, has to be continually brought up to date by supplements and revisions. A publishing society which has a continuous action, and a periodical issue, has facilities for supplementary volumes and revised lists which no individual author can have. The weakness of almost all extant Bibliographies is that they so rapidly become obsolete. They have no machinery for automatic revision. A society with a continuous life may readily secure this.

Such are the points as to which I propose to invite discussion and which I submit for consideration. As I began by saying, I have no thought of dogmatising or of insisting on any particular plan. If there were any support given me as to the accomplishment of such a work being desirable and feasible, all that I would ask is this—that after further consideration a small committee might be named to report to the Society, in its new collective form, the conclusions they have formed as to the possibility of the Society undertaking such a task, as to the type on which it might be framed, and as to the details and business arrangements on which such a publication could be based.

I shall not occupy your time by reviewing the various attempts that have been made in foreign countries to form historical bibliographies, the greater part of which are now obsolete, whilst none of them supply us with the type of what we are now in search of. It will be more useful to refer all interested in this subject to a new and very valuable little

book by Charles Langlois—his [1] 'Manuel de Bibliographie Historique,' which has just appeared. This compact, sensible, and accurate volume classifies and reviews all the works dealing with historical bibliography; and I shall take the sketch that he gives of previous attempts as the starting-point of my suggestions, without going over the ground anew. I shall also refer you to two very suggestive articles by Mr. Tedder, the accomplished Librarian of the Athenæum Club—articles unfortunately buried in special publications.[2]

Whilst the older bibliographies and most of the foreign ones show us rather what we should avoid than what we should imitate, there are a few French and German books of which it is essential to speak, from their conspicuous merits of one kind or other. The Bibliographies of universal history may be put aside at once, for it is manifestly impossible to treat a field so vast with thoroughness, in ample detail, and yet with accuracy. Such general historical bibliographies as we possess are either mere catalogues of books like the sections in Brunet's[3] 'Manuel du Libraire,' or Sonnenschein's[4] 'Best Books,' works which for English History may give the titles of about 1,000 books; or Oesterley's 'Wegweiser der Urkundensammlungen,' 1886; or Ersch's 'Literatur der Geschichte,' 1827; or else, like Professor C. Kendall Adams's[5] 'Manual of Historical Literature,' consist of running criticisms, to which continual exception will be taken.

The Middle Ages in Europe have engaged the labours of some laborious foreign scholars. Potthast's [6] 'Bibliotheca

[1] *Manuel de Bibliographie Historique*, par Ch. V. Langlois: I. Instruments Bibliographiques. Paris: 1896.

[2] *The Library Chronicle*, iii. 185: 'Proposals for a Bibliography of National History;' *The Library*, i. 15: Review of G. Monod's *Bibliographie de l'histoire de France*.

[3] J. C. Brunet, *Manuel du Libraire et de l'amateur de livres*, 5me éd. Paris: 1860–65. 6 vols. 8vo.

[4] Sonnenschein, *The Best Books*, 2nd ed. London and New York: 1891.

[5] C. Kendall Adams, LL.D., *Manual of Historical Literature*, 3rd ed. New York: 1889.

[6] August Potthast, *Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters bis* 1500. Berlin: 1895.

historica medii ævi,' which is a guide to the historical literature before 1500, is now being issued in a new and enlarged edition which has reached the word 'Mystère.' This for the ground it professes to cover is a masterly dictionary of bibliography; but its purpose is limited to the bibliography of works earlier than 1500, not noticing subsequent publications that relate to the same period. On the other hand M. Ulysse Chevalier[1] has devoted more than twenty years to his voluminous 'Répertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Age.' This vast work of 2,370 closely printed columns is now being followed up by a second part which has reached a thousand columns, down to the letter E; and if ever completed it is to be followed by a third part of hardly less formidable dimensions. The only merit of M. Chevalier's colossal undertaking is the indefatigable industry which has occupied him now for twenty-two years in collecting an enormous number of references in all European languages, even in obsolete periodicals. His first volume contains 40,000 articles, many of these articles containing some hundreds of references. The order is simply alphabetical: there is no classification: no estimate: no kind of analysis or description. Obsolete rubbish in forgotten and undiscoverable articles figure side by side with important standard works. It would be of little use to the ordinary reader to turn to the 600 references given under 'Dante' which range from Boccaccio to 'Hood's Magazine' and the 'Journal des Débats,' both of 1845, and omit the names of John Carlyle, W. W. Vernon, A. Butler, and Scartazzini. In his 'Topo-Bibliographie' the names of places may be useful, and such heads as 'Albigeois,' and the like, with fifty or sixty references. But when in his seventy columns for 'Angleterre' we find citations of Blackstone's 'History of England' but not Professor Freeman; the 'Christian Observer' but neither Hallam, Macaulay, nor Stubbs; Mrs. Markham, 'All the Year Round,' and

[1] Ulysse Chevalier, *Répertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Age—Bio-Bibliographie*, Part I. Paris: 1877–86; Part II. *Topo-Bibliographie*: A–B, B–E; 1894-5: Montbéliard.

'Lippincott's Magazine,' but not Milman—one wonders of what use such a compilation can be. At the same time a student may occasionally find some useful references to stray pieces that he might otherwise overlook.

I have only mentioned these works to eliminate those classes of which we have no use. We do not want bibliographies of universal history; we do not want mere catalogues of books in some given language, or of books written before some given date. We do not want miscellaneous dictionaries of undigested references to worthless, obsolete, and fugitive articles. But Chevalier's 400,000 references in one of his three volumes may at least suggest to us the usefulness of carefully selected references to minor pieces and periodical papers. Brunet and Lorenz and similar compilations are mere catalogues of books. Potthast gives us no modern literature at all. And Chevalier is voluminous without method, system, or knowledge.

Fortunately there are three books—bibliographies of national history—which *as far as they go*, come very much nearer to what we are seeking. One is German; one French; one English. They are[1] Dahlmann and Waitz, in the recent edition by Steindorff for German History; Gabriel Monod's[2] 'Bibliographie' for French History; and Mullinger's list of[3] 'Authorities for English History,' being the second part to Professor Gardiner's 'Introduction to the Study of English History.' All of these are well-known and very useful books, which it is needless to describe and it would be superfluous to praise. All three follow a scheme of chronological subdivision and are not dictionaries of names, or catalogues of books, but are true systematic bibliographies. Each have their own merits of plan; but none of them are complete. Monod follows Dahlmann's plan almost exactly, giving first a

[1] Dahlmann und Waitz, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte*, von E. Steindorff. Göttingen: 1894. 8vo.

[2] G. Monod, *Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France*. Paris: 1888. 8vo.

[3] S. R. Gardiner and J. Bass Mullinger, *Introduction to the Study of English History*, 3rd ed. London: 1894. 8vo.

list of works divided into classes—such as local and municipal histories, political institutions, legal, military, industrial sections. This occupies 132 pp. Then follows a second part divided into six epochs down to 1789—which occupies 240 pp. Mullinger's list of authorities is given only in chronological epochs. On the other hand, Mullinger gives an analysis and description of each work, with a careful estimate, whereas neither Dahlmann nor Monod give us any account or estimate of the books they name, except by an asterisk, nor even the titles with the needful fulness. As Mr. Tedder very justly remarks in the review in 'The Library' just quoted, 'the weak feature of Monod's book is that the author gives us no bibliographical information.' And this is true also of Dahlmann. I venture to submit that Dahlmann, Monod, and Mullinger are all right in what they include and wrong in what they omit. It is essential to give, as Mullinger does, but as Dahlmann and Monod do not do, some adequate account and estimate of every work or paper mentioned, with a full and exact title, a short summary of contents, and a practical account of editions. It is also essential to give, as Dahlmann and Monod both do, but as Mullinger has not done, at least two parts—one being a classified set of subjects, as well as a chronological part. And it would no doubt be desirable to add a third part, a critical bibliography of editions in a classified shape. What we really want is a systematic and critical list of works, first of those relating to classified subjects and institutions, then those relating to chronological epochs, and thirdly a critical bibliography or history of the books themselves. We want an account of the contents and an estimate of each work, and not simply a catalogue of titles.

Dahlmann in the new form of Steindorff, 1894, enlarged to nearly double its old dimensions (with 6,550 references in lieu of 3,753), is now, I believe, in every way but one the most systematic and scientific type of a bibliography of National History we possess. The one great defect of it is that it gives us neither estimate, analysis, nor even the full titles of the books that are cited, and it makes no attempt to go beyond

substantive works. Its scheme is excellent. The first part, with subjects under fifty headings, occupies the first quarter of the volume with 1,677 references. The chronological part, with nearly 5,000 references, is in eight chronological sections and comes down to 1888.

These three bibliographies of national history give us some idea of what is wanted, but as I said only *as far as they go.* They are none of them anything like exhaustive works, nor do they profess to be. Monod gives us 4,500 references or titles of books, the enlarged Dahlmann and Waitz somewhat more, *i.e.* 6,550. But Mullinger's excellent list is contained in 260 pp. of small 8vo. and does not mention more than 500 to 600 works. Mr. Mullinger expressly tells us that his list does not pretend 'to represent the bibliography of our historical literature.' It is in fact, what it is designed to be, a general students' manual and nothing more—excellent as far as it goes, but only presenting an outline of what a complete bibliography of English history might be made. Neither Dahlmann, Monod, nor Mullinger attempt to deal with details, pamphlets, occasional monographs, or periodical literature. It would be out of the question to expect anything of the kind within the limits of an octavo volume. It is here that Chevalier with his inexhaustible industry comes in. He alone, as far as I know, has gone into the bye-ways and hedges of the literature and research scattered about in essays, periodicals, pamphlets, and even journals. And though I must confess that his portentous dustheaps of historical reference form little but masses of confused rubbish for the most part, it is true that from time to time a judicious reader may pick up valuable nuggets and lumps of ore well worth the smelting. The 400,000 references of the 'Bio-bibliographie' will only confuse and bewilder an ordinary student. But if we were to reduce the matter to round numbers, I suppose we want say 40,000 references rather than Monod's 4,000.

I will now only enumerate the conditions on which I believe it possible to construct a systematic survey of the printed authorities for English history.

I. The scheme would not include Manuscripts. A student of course can always procure an ordinary published work. A manuscript he can only consult by going to the library where the particular manuscript is. When he gets there he will almost always find excellent catalogues, calendars, and ample assistance. I have not mentioned Sir T. Duffus Hardy's great work—the 'Descriptive Catalogue of MSS. relating to Great Britain and Ireland,' 1862–1871, first, because it is devoted to Manuscripts, secondly, because it deals with early epochs only down to 1327, and thirdly, because it is much stronger in the bibliography of MSS. than in criticism of their contents and value. Beda in Hardy fills 26 pp. whilst Roger Bacon fills only one page—which is a rather disproportionate allowance from the historical point of view. The second part of Hardy's first volume contains a most valuable list of printed books, which occupies no less than 238 pp. and may refer to some 5,000 volumes. This list would always be most serviceable to any future bibliographer.

II. It needs little argument to show that the scheme should be limited to English history. The failure of all attempts to deal with general history, the vastness of the field of English history, and the glaring errors and oversights even of learned men who have essayed to cover a single epoch for European history, all warn us to limit our task to the history of our own land and people. It would be ridiculous to limit the catalogues to English writers and scholars. The result would be that we should exclude Froissart, Polydore Vergil, Motley, Guizot, Ranke, and Gneist.

III. It is essential to introduce the division into epochs by a classified scheme of subjects, institutions, general and special titles, as where Monod, under the heading 'Sources Législatives,' enters the 'Assises de Jérusalem' &c., by Beugnot, and the 'Établissements de Saint-Louis' by Viollet. This plan was first adopted by Dahlmann who was followed by Monod. My own opinion is, that the second, the chrono-

logical and principal part of a full bibliography should be followed by a third part giving a critical account of the best editions, the translations, commentaries, and any corollaries or supplements of the works mentioned. This would be a bibliography of books, not of matter. It would be the shortest of the three, and of course might be included in the other parts. I doubt if the biographical section as found in Chevalier's 'Bio-Bibliographie' should be added. No other writer has attempted anything of the kind. And for English history we already have a very ample 'Dictionary of Biography' in the great work edited by Mr. Leslie Stephen and Mr. Sidney Lee, now happily approaching the last lap of its immense orbit.

IV. It seems to me quite essential that the work should have some critical estimate of the books noted, as, without this, the student is presented with a mere library catalogue, and is left to his resources to discover what is valuable and what is unimportant, what is of first-class authority and what is of doubtful authority, though it may contain an occasional fact or suggestion to be noted. Mullinger introduces the excellent plan of classifying his authorities under three heads —Contemporary, Non-Contemporary, Modern. It is curious that the bibliographies in English alone do this. Sir T. D. Hardy's great work contains ample criticism; so has Mr. Mullinger, and so has the American manual of Professor Adams, though we cannot always agree with the criticism. Neither Potthast, Dahlmann, Chevalier, nor Monod attempt anything but the slightest indication of value or of contents, Dahlmann and Monod simply marking their special selections with a star. In my opinion, any detailed criticism would be a failure, especially in a work of many hands and bearing the *imprimatur* of a society. A brief summary of value and a general classification of rank as authority, would be, I think, desirable, if not indispensable. It is, perhaps, even more essential that the work should give a summary sketch of the contents, scope, and extent of every work cited—something, I mean, corresponding to the analyses so admirably given in

many of the 'Calendars of State Papers,' but not running to the length and detail of so many articles in Sir T. Hardy's 'Descriptive Catalogue of MSS.,' or even so full as those given by Mr. Mullinger.

V. In proposing that the Bibliography should be complete, I by no means intend by that that it should be *exhaustive* in the sense of containing every notice, long or short, good, bad, and indifferent, that can be traced in any printed page. Comprehensiveness of that mechanical kind always ends in confusion. We might as well present the student with fifty volumes extracted from the catalogue of the British Museum. A rational historical bibliography, like a rational history, demands selection, judgment, proportion, careful winnowing of the wheat from the chaff. A mere catalogue of books, essays, articles, or notices is the proper task of a librarian working up a librarian's catalogue. He has to tabulate—not to judge or choose. Chevalier shows us what a Tower of Babel may be built up by sheer plodding for a whole generation without sense, judgment, or even learning. A bibliography, to be worthy of English scholarship, however complete, however exhaustive in its research, should be emphatically a select, systematic, and judicious assortment of authorities. Just as a real history is not a series of annals, so a real bibliography is not a mere catalogue of books.

In conclusion, the point which I desire especially to submit to this Society is as follows. Experience seems to have proved that neither learning nor industry can enable any one scholar to produce a scientific bibliography on a great scale—so to speak, off his own bat—any more than a single scholar could have produced the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' or the 'New English Dictionary,' or the 'Calendars of State Papers.' A scholar, who is a thoroughly competent guide for some definite area of historical research, will inevitably fall into errors and omissions if he attempts to handle an unlimited field. Our Society, with all the new blood which is shortly to stimulate its veins, can supply guidance for a variety of special subjects as well as for a

series of epochs. Roughly speaking, I think there is room for at least twenty or thirty different sections. My own estimate of scale would be about one of the larger volumes of the 'Calendars of State Papers'—one volume for each part, be they two or three. And perhaps three or four years of labour, when a type and scheme had been thoroughly settled, might bring the work to a close. It would be a work worthy of these two societies, and would remove from English historical learning that reproach which Mr. Tedder has so well described in his paper—'that the student has now to grope his way through unclassified catalogues.'

THE *ÉCOLE DES CHARTES* AND ENGLISH RECORDS

By Professor F. YORK POWELL

Read June 17, 1897

My subject obviously deserves a skilled advocate to present it to the public, but as a professional historical student speaking to historical students I may be pardoned if I attempt only the plainest exposition, and 'let me find a charter in your voice to assist my simpleness.'

Probably the best way will be to begin with a brief account of the French École des Chartes. Projected in 1807 by the Duc de Cadore as a 'new kind of Port Royal,' and in more detailed terms as 'a special school of French history,' it was approved of by Napoleon. 'A knowledge of the method of studying history is a real science in itself,' he says, and into his scheme a course of bibliography, the history of legislation, the history of the art of war, the literary and critical study of history, duly entered. But events hindered the realisation of this Imperial School of History, and it was not till 1820 that M. de Gerando, the Duc de Cadore's former secretary, again urged on the King's minister, M. Simeon, the establishment of a *School of Charters*. Simeon's report was agreed to, and on February 22, 1821, a royal Ordinance authorised the new institution. It consisted of twelve students and two professors working at the Bibliothèque Royale and the Archives du Royaume. L'Abbé Lespine, of the Library, and M. Pavillet, of the Historic section of the Archives, were the first instructors.

By an ordinance of Charles the Tenth, November 11, 1839, the school was reorganised (according to a project of M. Rives adopted in a report of the Comte de la Bourdonnoye) on a deeper and wider basis; and by another ordinance of Louis Philippe, December 31, 1846, still further enlarged and improved owing to the exertions of the Comte de Salvaudy and a number of intelligent députés. The plan of studies then fixed is the basis of that at present pursued, as modified by the later decrees of January 30, 1869, and May 12, 1882, as the conspectus below will show:

1846	1869	1882	Present teachers and hours per week
	First Year		
Palæography .	Palæography	Palæography	M. Gautier,[1] 2 h.
Numismatic . .	Romance Tongues	Romance Tongues	M. Meyer, 2 h.
Mediæval Latin .	Bibliography and Classification of Material	Bibliography and Classification of Material	M. Montaiglon, 1 h.
	Second Year		
Diplomatic . .	Diplomatic	Diplomatic	M. Giry, 2 h.
Classification of Authors	Classification of Authors	Classification of Authors	M. Montaiglon, 1 h.
—	Constitutional Law	Constitutional Law	M. Roy, 2 h.
—	—	Sources de l'histoire de France	M. Luce, 1 h.
	Third Year		
Historical Geography	—	—	—
Constitutional Law	—	Sources de l'histoire de France	M. Luce, 1 h.
Archæology . .	Archæology	Archæology	M. Lasteyrie, 2 h.
Law: Civil, Canon, &c.	Law: Civil, Canon, &c.	Law: Civil, Canon, &c.	M. Viollet, 2 h.

These professors with M. de Mas Latrie (the chronologist) who is Honorary Professor, and M. Morel Fatio (the well-known Spanish scholar) who is secretary, make up the personnel. It has rooms and library in the New Sorbonne.

[1] This devoted and accomplished scholar passed away while this paper was in the press.

The Committee of Directeurs consists of M. Delisle, the head of the Bibliothèque Nationale, M. Meyer, the Directeur de l'Ecole des Chartes, M. Servois, Directeur of the Archives Nationales, and MM. Wallon, de Rosière, G. Paris, Hauréau, and de Mas Latrie.

The modest budget of 70,000 fr. is thus made up :[1]

Professors	7000
Director	1000
Secretary	4000
Attendance Fee to Committee	2400
Servants and Porters	3550
Eight Scholarships of 600 fr.	4800
Temporary payment to Students for work at Cataloguing and Law Listing, &c.	3600
Facsimiles	2500
Books and Binding	2450
	71300
Deduct value of services rendered unpaid	1300
	70000

The students, who must be Frenchmen of under 25, B.A.'s, and not exceed twenty in all, are admitted by an entrance examination in November. This examination, both oral and written, comprises Latin prose unseen, history and geography of France (German, English, Italian and Spanish may also be taken up by any student). Those admitted have to pass what we should call "Collections" at Easter, being examined by the professors, assisted by the Committee, upon the Interpretation of Documents, and upon the lectures of the past terms (the marks gained counting for $\frac{1}{4}$); and further, at end of every year, a more elaborate and general examination, both *vivâ voce* and in writing (counting for $\frac{3}{4}$), by the Committee, assisted by the professors. On these examinations depend the order of merit and the permission to continue at the school. A thesis ends the course, and by this

[1] All these particulars, together with those that follow, are taken from the excellent Livret de l'École des Chartes, 1821-91, published by La Société de École des Chartes. Picard, Paris.

thesis, if accepted, the student acquires the regular diploma of *Archiviste Paléographe.* The two highest in merit the first year, and the three best of the second and third years, receive each a scholarship of 600 fr.

It is the special privilege of the *Archiviste Paléographe* that certain posts are reserved for him in the Archives National and departmental, public libraries, academies, &c.

You see the bearings of the whole institution; it gives an advanced historic education; it fits a man for a practical course of scientific research; it keeps up a real standard of historic learning, and it turns out a great deal of first-class work—theses, reports, monographs and treatises.

It may here also be added that the fine series of historic studies known as the Bibliothèque of the École des Chartes and started by students of this school in 1839 has been of highest use to all such Frenchmen as read history or study their country's legal institutions. And it is the École des Chartes that has provided the philologue with his best material for the study of the French dialects of the past.

It not only provides the teaching but it helps to find a career for the taught when he has made himself efficient. Its training is not designed for the ordinary man; it is not 'popular'; it has nothing more in view than the modest function of keeping up a small number of trained specialists, who are to serve the nation by giving it the benefit of their peculiar aptitudes, and of providing men for a few posts that require this special aptitude. It does not take the place of the ordinary history teaching in schools or universities, which is purely *educational*, intended to open the mind and secure general knowledge of a certain number of important events in the past. Its teaching is purely *technical*, its duty to train the men who are to deal with the material on which are founded all the histories that professors and schoolmasters teach from, and that children and young people read.

This excellent, cheap and creditable institution is indeed one of those that make one ready to fall in with the proposition that after all they really do some things better in France.

In this case the French have seen the necessity for organisation, and have been careful to adapt the means to the end. I am told there are Philistines in the French Chamber who yearly attack the modest item of the Budget (*not* £3,000) that provides for the existence of the school, but I have no doubt they are easily discomfited, for there is no French institution more deserving of the support of every thinking person in France, or more worthy of the pride that Frenchmen are said to take in their administrative institutions. Not only Italy, Spain, Russia, Austria, but even Germany has learnt the value of the school, and been at pains to set up an institution of similar scope. There are the schools of Milan, 1842; Venice and Vienna, 1856; Madrid, 1856; St. Petersburg, 1877; the Vatican, 1884; and the German school now organising if we are correctly informed.

How do we, practical people that we are, stand? What have we done in this direction? Lately in London, as at Oxford and Cambridge, means have been provided by which the young man who wishes seriously to study the sources of history may begin his training for original work. At Oxford at present there are regular courses of palæography given by Mr. F. Madan, of the Bodleian Library; of diplomatic given by Mr. R. L. Poole; of sources and bibliography by the Regius Professor; while law and constitutional history have for many years been taught by specialists, and there are libraries accessible where what can be learnt from books may be learnt and where there is plenty of manuscript material available for elementary training. At Cambridge Mr. H. Hall, of the Record Office, is announced to lecture for the University. In London, 'The School of Economics' at Adelphi Terrace already provides similar teaching in the elements of palæography and diplomatic. A man who has learnt to read an ordinary mediæval document, to understand its meaning, to date it, and have some idea as to its true significance, has learnt something real and may be trusted to benefit by further training. What we lack is an *advanced course* and a prospect of employment

for the persons trained sufficient to induce them to give themselves up to historic work. Now this advanced training can only be supplied in the big libraries or the Record Office, where the calendaring, classifying and abstracting of manuscript material can be properly taught and pursued. But there is no machinery at present provided for such advanced training at the National Library or at the Record Office. These establishments have admirable officials of their own, whom they have trained for their own work; but that is all, they have no means of doing more. This is not enough. In this country we have literally unrivalled stores of manuscript historic material, for, owing to the blessings of insularity and that good fortune that has spared us the destruction which has swept away so much abroad, we have had no Thirty Years' War, no foreign invasion, no violent domestic revolution to deplore. Time, ignorance and bigotry have, of course, done their work, quietly, persistently and relentlessly, but they have spared much.

And this mass of documents has real scientific worth, the economic, legal and social histories of England are yet to be written, and this manuscript pabulum, as yet only partially known and in no kind of way exhaustively used, will supply the material. The Reports of the Historical Manuscript Commission, the Calendars of State Papers, the Roll Series, Archæologia, the publications of the Selden, Camden, Surtees, and other societies, all amply witness to the truth of this position. There are no proper offices where county documents, local records, and other valuable papers can be deposited safely and accessibly. Truly the harvest is plentiful (for example, the accounts of one single Oxford college have furnished the greater part of the matter for the best conspectus of the English economic conditions of the past that has as yet appeared), the labourers are few and unpaid. Storehouses and barns there are none. The Record Office has its own work to do on scanty means; it is well housed, but not even yet supplied with a proper reference library. The British Museum, with its many separate departments, each needing money

and men, is by no means lavishly supported. Neither can it undertake local work.

The objection, of course, is obvious, so obvious that I have heard it from a Chancellor of Exchequer: 'Oh yes, all this may be so; we will admit it, for the sake of argument, if you like, but these things only concern and interest a few specialists.' As if the books taught in your board schools, the books studied in your universities, on which all your own knowledge of the history of your own country is based, were sent down from Heaven, instead of being, as they are, the work of a few specialists. You have established armies of teachers. From whom are they to learn but from these few specialists? There is no need of enforcing such obvious propositions here, though there would be at the Treasury. 'Well, then, what do you propose? Let us come to practical considerations.' I have no cut and dried scheme, but I think something of this sort would be reasonable and practicable:—

(*a*) Let two persons be specially entrusted with the work of giving two hours a week instruction for eight months, say, of the year, to properly approved candidates (a small number), who should attend their courses at the British Museum and the Record Office, and learn under them the actual work connected with the duties of an archivist. We will presume these selected candidates to have already gone through at least a year's instruction at a university and to have a good general knowledge of English history.

(*b*) During their two years' course of instruction a certain number of bursaries should be given to such selected candidates—say £100 a year for two years while they are under instruction, in the same way as money is granted to selected Indian candidates; and £150 the third year, during which, having obtained their certificate, they will be working for government according to some plan suggested and supervised by one of their Instructors.

(*c*) Certain posts at the Record Office, the British Museum, Government libraries, &c., should be open only to

such approved *Certificated Archivists*. If two or three certificates were granted every year it would probably be sufficient at first, though to do the work that has to be done upon English records within a reasonable time more students would of course be needed.

(*d*) In concert with the County Councils, the Government should establish County Archives or Registries where the public documents of the districts should be preserved and arranged under the care of a Certificated Archivist. Counties might be grouped for this purpose—for example, a single office might suffice Oxford, Bucks and Berks. These public County Registries or Local Record Offices would also naturally become, under proper conditions, places of deposit for any private documents of interest (old counterparts of leases, court rolls), also of copies of interesting documents, such as exist buried away in the musty boxes of nearly every great country lawyer's office, and certified copies, or, at all events, calendars or titled lists of local documents existing elsewhere. It might even be the duty of the archivist to guard the old volumes of the parish registers, supplying legible copies to the parishes. One can easily imagine the rapid growth and development of such a local centre for history and archæology. The part-salary [1] of an archivist, the rent of a house made safe from fire and other risks, and the pay of a resident porter and of a copying clerk would not cost much. The furnishing of a room for the archivist, another for enquirers and workers, with a small reference library, would be needed, and for all these purposes an outlay of a few hundreds would make ample provision to start with and a moderate yearly sum would keep the library going, cover repairs, etc. Ten such local offices would provide for the needs of the country for a time at all events.

We cannot afford to neglect organisation. We lose time and money as long as we do so; the longer such a matter is

[1] Part should be paid by the County Councils themselves, and fees might be charged for certified copies, &c.

put off the more difficult it often is to get it properly done, and when it is at last done greater expense is nearly always involved. If history is to be of any use, and, by universal consensus (an argument that will weigh more with politician than student), the study of history is a valuable branch of knowledge, it must be scientific—that is, it must be based upon properly ascertained facts methodically studied. All available material must be examined. Economists tell us that the past is helping them to unravel the problem of the present. Mr. Maitland has been able, working on documents hitherto neglected or imperfectly studied, to reconstruct the legal history of the age that saw the first modelling of our present highly developed institutions. There is no need of multiplying illustrations. Ignorance is always expensive. Unnecessary ignorance is loss that may be avoided.

I am not asking for the Endowment of Research. I am asking the nation to undertake certain useful work it has neglected, work that it will pay it to have done, and that it will lose money by neglecting any longer. It can get this work done well at little cost. The French have profited by recognising the need for this work and providing practical means to meet it. They have the best historical school at present of any country in the world. Yet with all their wealth of material they cannot compare with us in the completeness or size of their records. Their school attracts pupils from all parts of the world, and they are extremely hospitable in granting instruction to such strangers as are duly qualified to receive it—a fact I am glad to be able to acknowledge publicly on behalf of Oxford pupils and colleagues of my own. Let us for once follow the French example, and garner and guard our scattered and hitherto unused riches while there is time, leisure and money available. We shall not repent it.

I do not think such a scheme will lack approval. The Deputy Keeper of the Records has already, both by pen and voice, urged the need of further organisation and further expenditure in these directions. Neither he nor the Principal

Librarian of the British Museum would, I fancy, object to be provided with a certain number of properly trained assistants, instead of having to take in untrained novices and waste time over their training. Scarce a member of this Society but has at one time or another wished, and wished in vain, for such help as the Local Record Offices could afford, and deplored that the modern English State has not long ago copied the innocent wisdom of the mediæval Church in providing district storehouses and keepers for its documents. Few but those who have experienced it can believe the weary loss of time, pains, and often temper caused by the present *tohu-bohu*, a loss entirely unnecessary too. As it is, one has often great difficulty in establishing the existence of a document, greater still in getting at it—even when the locale is known. Several ancient municipal corporations I know of have never had their old papers indexed or put in order since the sixteenth century. The Record Office cannot do local work, its own arrears are far too heavy; and its annual accessions are enormous and increasing. Moreover it is the proper business of the local archivist to know where local documents are, and to help one to get at them speedily. When this to-be-desired official comes into being we need not fear that he will have too little to do. His probable usefulness to us working historians, it is difficult to over estimate. One can see a hundred ways in which he could help us. His indices alone would lighten our lives. No real historian grudges trouble, but every sensible man grudges useless trouble, and from this our local archivist would largely save us.

But that this advanced training, this class of Archivists, and these Local Record Offices are only likely to come into existence by the united exertions of those who, like the members of this Society, really care to promote the study of history as a science is patent. I therefore venture to leave this matter, for the present at all events, in your hands, and hope for our schemes a safe and speedy delivery.

SOME SURVIVORS OF THE ARMADA IN IRELAND

By MAJOR MARTIN A. S. HUME

Read January 21, 1897.

Of the great fleet of 130 sail that left Corunna for England on July 12, 1588, 65 vessels, exactly one-half, perished. At least 32 of these foundered with all hands in the wild gales of the North Atlantic, where, when, and how will now never be revealed. Of the remaining 33, two were lost on the Hebrides, but no particulars are known, two were disabled and abandoned in the Channel, five were subsequently lost on the coast of France, two were crippled in the fighting in the North Sea and drifted on to the Dutch coast, one was lost at Bigbury Bay, Devon, and two perished on their return to Spain. Full particulars of all these ships except those lost on the Hebrides are known. The remaining 19 vessels were wrecked off the Orkneys and the rugged coast of Ireland. At what places and under what circumstances most of them perished has never yet been satisfactorily established. This is not surprising, for several reasons. It will be seen that most of the places mentioned in the Irish State Papers as the scenes of wrecks are not identifiable on modern maps, not only the names of villages but the names and divisions of districts and counties having been greatly changed. It will be seen, also, that the somewhat meagre reports sent by the Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam, and the Presidents of the provinces, are vague as to the localities of the wrecks, and in nearly every case are silent as to the names of the ships. The English in Ireland were in a wild panic, uncertain of the strength and intentions of the Spaniards, surrounded by a

people known to be disaffected, and ready to join the invaders; so that the English officers were much more interested in killing off the intruders without pity than in recording the names of the wrecks that were being shattered by the roaring surf perhaps miles away from them. On the other hand, the poor terrified starved creatures, half dead with cold and drowning, who struggled ashore, with the momentary fear of violent death before their eyes, cared nothing for the names of the frowning rocks against which their ships had perished, and if any were moved by curiosity to ask their names, the answer in the wild speech of Ireland was not such as would dwell in the memories of uneducated men. In some few cases I have seen, where the better educated tried to put into writing phonetically the Irish names, the result is absolutely unintelligible. Another element of uncertainty is, that in the few written statements of the survivors that remain to us very rarely is the name given of the ship in which the writer sailed. It has generally to be inferred. There were, moreover, no less than 9 ships called the 'San Juan,' 8 called the 'Concepcion,' and so on. It is, therefore, not surprising that hardly in one instance has the locality of a particular wreck been definitely fixed. Captain Fernandez Duro has not attempted it. He merely repeats the various statements as he finds them. Professor Laughton, though his researches have helped us greatly on other points, has not done so to any considerable extent upon this. Where such distinguished predecessors have left the riddle unsolved, I cannot hope to find a complete answer to it. The most I shall attempt to do is to fix clearly the sites of a few of the disasters, and guess at a few others; drawing my conclusions from a large number of small circumstances and subsidiary facts, with the details of which I shall not trouble you.

From the fight on July 29, the one idea of the Duque of Medina Sidonia was to get back to Spain anyhow. Shut up in his cabin, inaccessible and hopeless, he left the management of details to others. The old sea-dogs Bertondona, Recalde, Oquendo, and the rest of them, were raging in their hearts,

cursing their leader for a craven, yet forced to obey his general orders, to run up north without charts to 60° N. latitude, north of the Orkneys, then to run far out to the west to escape the coast of Ireland, and so to set a safe course for Spain. The food was nearly all rotten, the water almost undrinkable, the men were dying of scurvy like flies, the S.W. winds, which were the Duke's excuse for running up the North Sea, would, with the added fogs and storms of late autumn, be a fatal obstruction to his voyage home from the high latitudes whither he was bound; but the Duke's poor spirit was crushed, and his one idea was to set his foot on Spanish soil and keep it there, and let others shift for themselves. Those ships which could follow him sufficiently to the west, and were able to stand the terrible weather, eventually beat home through constant south-easterly gales, and incredible sufferings from famine, pestilence, and drought. But many ships dropped off to leeward, or were unable to wear sufficiently to the west to clear the Irish coast, and with these latter we have principally to deal.

Let us first take up the story of the most northerly wreck as it is told in the diary of a man on board a hulk which he does not name, but which I know was the 'Gran Grifon,' with General Juan Gomez de Medina on board. The manuscript is in the Royal Academy of History, Madrid, and has been printed in Spanish by Captain Fernandez Duro.

On the morning of August 8 (O.S.), they, on the 'Gran Grifon,' found themselves out of sight of the body of the Armada with only three consorts, which I know to have been the great Venetian ship 'Valenzera,' the hulk 'Bark of Hamburg,' and the hulk 'Castillo Negro.' They would then be north of the Orkneys. For the next twelve days they struggled slowly to the west, with the wind dead ahead making hardly any way. Then, on the 21st, the 'Bark of Hamburg' signalled that she was foundering. Her seams were open and her pumps choked. So her company, about 250 men, was hastily transferred to the other three ships. But before the stores could be got out of her she sank On the night of August 23

the two other ships had disappeared. Of one, the great Venetian, we shall hear again, but the 'Castillo Negro' had sunk in the night to be heard of no more. Still battling with head winds, fog, sleet, and tempest, the 'Gran Grifon' struggled to get to the west, until September 7, when a great storm fell upon her and the efforts of all men at the pumps, night and day, failed to keep the water down. So they decided, in their dire danger, to run with the wind for the coast of Norway, and I will now let the man tell his story in his own words:

'We ran back before the wind for three days, when we sighted an island of Scotland in about 57½° N. latitude [no doubt, the north Orkneys], and after we had gone about 10 leagues further we fell in with a N.W. wind which invited us to turn our faces once more towards our dear Spain, especially as the moon entered a new quarter, and we thought the wind would hold. So we turned back and sailed for three days more to the latitude we had been in before. But when we got there, we were only fit to die, for the wind was so strong and the sea so wild that the waves mounted to the skies, knocking the ship about so, that the men were all exhausted, and yet were unable to keep down the water that leaked through our gaping seams. If we had not had the wind astern we could not have kept afloat at all. But by God's mercy during the next two days the weather moderated, and we were able to patch up some of the leaks with ox-hides and planks. And so we ran till September 13, when the wind rose against us, and we decided to turn back again and try to reach Scotland. On the 15th, we sighted some islands that the pilots said were Scottish, and inhabited by savages. And so we sailed till the 16th to the N.E. in search of land. On that day we sighted other islands which we tried to avoid so as not to be lost. The weather then got so stormy that our poor repairs were all undone, and we had to keep both pumps always going to keep the water down. So we decided to sail for the first Scottish land, even if we had to run the hulk ashore. Late in the afternoon of the 16th we were troubled to see an island to windward of us, for it was getting

dark, and we feared to be amongst islands in the night. We had hoped we were free of them. During the night we gave ourselves up for lost, for the seas ran mountains high, and the rain fell in torrents. At two in the morning we saw an island right ahead of us, which, as may be supposed, filled us with consternation after all the tribulation we had passed through. But God in His mercy at that moment sent us a sudden gleam of light through the dark night, and so enabled us to avoid the danger. Then the blackness fell as dense as before. Two hours afterwards another island loomed up before us, so close that it seemed impossible to weather it. But God came to our aid as usual, and sent a more vivid gleam than before. It was so bright that I asked whether it were the daylight. So we kept off the island, though much troubled, for we should have been lost if we had not doubled it. This was the isle of Cream, where we had decided to bring up if we could not reach Scotland, though we did not recognise it until later as we had run further than we thought. At dawn, two hours later, we discovered it, and in fear of the heavy sea we tried to get near the island again, but after trying for four hours against wind and tide we found it impossible. The sea kept giving us such dreadful blows, that truly our one thought was that our lives were ended, and each one of us reconciled himself to God as well as he could, and prepared for the long long journey that seemed inevitable. As to force the hulk any more would only have ended it and our lives the sooner, we determined to cease our efforts. The poor soldiers, too, lost all spirit to work at the pumps. The two companies—230 men in all, and 40 we had taken from the other ship, had pumped incessantly and worked with buckets, but the water still increased, till there were thirteen spans of water over the carlings (as they call them) and all efforts failed to reduce it an inch. So we gave way to despair, and each one called upon the Virgin Mary to be our intermediary in so bitter a pass ; and we looked towards the land with full eyes and hearts, as the reader may imagine. And God send that he may be able to imagine the smallest part

of what it was, for after all there is a great difference between those who suffer and those who look upon suffering from afar off.

'At last—when we thought all hope was gone, except through God and His holy Mother, who never fails those who call upon Him—at two o'clock in the afternoon we sighted an island ahead of us. This was Fair Isle, where we arrived at sunset, much consoled, though we saw we should still have to suffer. But anything was better than drinking salt water. We anchored in a sheltered spot we found, this day of our great peril, September 27 (i.e. 17 O.S.), 1588. We found the island peopled by seventeen households in huts, more like hovels than anything else. They are savage people, whose usual food is fish, without bread, except a few barley-meal bannocks cooked over the embers of the fuel they use, which they make or extract from the earth and call turf. They have some cattle, quite enough for themselves, for they rarely eat meat. They depend mainly upon the milk and butter from their cows, using their sheep's wool principally for clothing. They are very dirty people, neither Christians nor altogether heretics. It is true they confess that the doctrine that once a year is preached to them by people sent from another island, nine leagues off, is not good, but they say they dare not contradict it, which is a pity. Three hundred men of us landed on the island, but could save none of our provisions. From that day, September 28 (18) till November 14, we lost fifty of our men—most of them dying of hunger—amongst others the master and mate of the hulk. We had decided to send a messenger to the governor of the next island to beg for some boats to carry us to Scotland to seek rescue, but the weather were so heavy that we could not send until October 27 (17), when the weather was fine, and they went. They have not yet returned, in consequence of the violence of the sea.'

And here the curtain falls upon this man's narrative. The sequel must be told from other sources. James Melville, the Puritan professor and divine of St. Andrews, the nephew of the more famous Andrew Melville, one of the makers of

the Church of Scotland, kept a diary in which he relates that during the winter of 1588, when he was minister of the town of Anstruther in the Firth of Forth, he lay in bed early one morning, when one of the baillies of the town appeared at his bedside, and told him that a ship full of Spaniards had entered their harbour; but that there was no cause for fear, as they had come not to give mercy but to ask for it. The minister, having the gift of tongues, and being a wise man, was begged to advise the magistrates what they should do. They decided to give audience to the principal Spanish officer. Melville says he was a venerable old man, of large stature and martial countenance, who entered the town hall, and, bowing low, touching the minister's shoe with his hand, said that he was Juan Gomez de Medina, commander of twenty hulks, which his master King Philip has sent out to avenge the insults he had received from England, but God for their sins had fought against them, and had scattered them. The ship in which he had been had been driven away from the Armada and wrecked on Fair Isle; and after escaping the merciless waves and rocks, and enduring great hardships from hunger and cold, he had come, with such of his men as had been preserved, to seek succour from the Scots. The Puritan minister improved the occasion. He was an enemy, he said, of the Bishop of Rome and his vassal, the King of Spain, who burnt and harried the Scottish Protestants who resorted to his dominions for trade; but they would return good for evil, and show the Papists how much better was the Scottish faith than theirs, by helping them in their dire distress. When Gomez de Medina afterwards learnt from Melville of the sad fate of the Armada, the tears flowed down his furrowed cheeks; and whilst Gomez de Medina lived no Scot in trouble in Spain ever appealed to him in vain. Melville says that 'the privates to the number of 13 score, for the maist part young beardless men, silly, trauchled and hungered, were supplied with kaill, pottage and fishe.'

Besides these 270 men in Scotland, there had arrived by

this time—January 1589—many more from Ireland, and the company of a Ragusan ship, 'San Juan,' which was wrecked in the Hebrides, but of which no detailed account exists. One of the captains (Legorreta), who had been wrecked on Fair Isle, sent to the Duke of Parma from Edinburgh, saying that he and another captain had reorganised their companies, and had 800 men ready for service. Many of these were afterwards sent to Flanders, and served in the wars of the League, but many remained. It will be recollected that the 'Gran Grifon' lost sight of the Venetian ship 'Valenzera' off the Orkneys in the great storm of August 23. She must have been more handy at wearing to windward than the 'Gran Grifon,' for by September 4 she was off the north coast of Ulster. What happened to her and her company may be gathered from various passages in the Irish State Papers, but I have found the actual statement signed by two survivors, which gives a better and more connected account than any other, and has never hitherto been noticed, so far as I know, by Duro or anyone else. It is the statement of the two soldiers, Juan de Nova, of the company of Don Alonso de Luzon, and Francisco de Borja, of the company of Garcia Manrique, made after they had, with incredible hardships, managed to reach the Spanish ambassador, who was then at a village near Blois, owing to the war and anarchy which existed in France. The 'Valenzera' was one of the largest ships of the fleet, 1,100 tons, and carried 500 soldiers (with those she had taken from the 'Bark of Hamburg'), and perhaps eighty sailors; although the English accounts, as usual, greatly exaggerating the number of men on board, say that she had 1,100. After losing sight of the 'Gran Grifon' she caught up with the main body of the Armada again, but on September 2, during a tempest, her seams opened, and the ship leaked so much that all efforts at the pumps failed. As she was in a sinking condition, the senior officer on board, Colonel Don Alonso de Luzon, decided to land his men. The ship had just doubled Innishowen Head at the mouth of Lough Foyle, when it was seen that she was foundering,

and she was hastily run into Glangavenny Bay, a little to the west of the headland. They only had one boat, and in her they hurriedly began to land the men with their arms, but before the task could be completed the great 'Valenzera' went down with forty men on board, the rest being saved. 'We learnt,' say the writers, 'that the island was held by the Queen of England's troops, and that at a castle called Duhort there lived an Irish bishop named Cornelius.' (This Bishop Cornelius is called in the English records the Bishop of Down, but I have seen many of his signatures as Bishop of Killaloe [Laonensis].) The castle was, of course, not really called Duhort, but that and the whole country belonged to the O'Dogherty. We learn from the account written by the commanders of the English force, the brothers Hovenden, that the real name of the castle was Illagh, eighteen miles from the spot where the 'Valenzera' sank. The roads were bad; so, say the survivors, 'after having been three days on the road towards the bishop's castle we came within a day's journey of the place, and our Colonel Don Alonso de Luzon sent a message to the bishop saying that we were wrecked Catholics, and begged his help and advice. The bishop replied that we should come to the castle and make a pretence of taking it by force, discharging our harquebuses &c., and it should then be surrendered to us. This was so that the Queen's officers might not say he had surrendered the castle voluntarily.

The Colonel and the rest of us then set forward, and when we arrived within sight of the castle those within fired a cannon in the direction where the Queen's garrison lay. The Colonel, fearing that the firing of the cannon meant treachery, refused to enter the castle, and directed his course by the borders of a bog towards a dismantled castle near. We then saw that the Queen's forces were approaching to the number of 200 horse, and as many foot harquebusiers and bowmen. We thereupon halted, and the enemy did likewise, drums being beaten for a parley. They asked us what we were doing in the Queen's dominions, and our

Colonel replied that we had been cast upon the island by wreck, and begged to be allowed by payment to obtain a ship to take us to Spain. We were told this could not be, and that we must surrender as prisoners of war. We replied that if that were the only alternative, we would die fighting as befitted Spaniards. The English then told us that if we did not surrender at once, three thousand of the Queen's troops were on their way thither, and would cut all our throats. But we still refused to surrender; and both forces remained halted all that night. The next night the enemy sounded the attack at three points, and the fighting continued all night. The next morning, whilst we were trying to improve our position, the drums sounded for a parley. The Colonel, with Captains Beltran del Salto and Geronimo de Aybar, went down to the level of the bog to hear what the enemy had to say. The Major of the enemy (his name is not stated, but we now know it to have been John Kelly) advised them to lay down our arms, and he would conduct them to the Queen's governor in Dublin, who would send them to the Queen. The Major made many offers and promises, and as our men were dying with hunger, the enemy having cut off our supplies, the Colonel consented to lay down our arms on fair terms of war, namely, that each man should keep his best suit of clothes. The English pledged their words to this, and we laid down our arms. As soon as the enemy had conveyed them to the other side of the bog towards Dublin, they fell upon us in a body, and despoiled us of everything we possessed; leaving us quite naked, and killing those who offered the least resistance. Our Colonel complained to the Major of the enemy, who said that the pillage had been done by the soldiers without his orders; but he pledged his word that our men should be dressed on their arrival at a castle where he intended to pass the night, two miles from where we then were. When we had gone half the distance the Major said that the roads were bad, so we would bivouac in the open for that night. The enemy formed a square, inside of which were

placed the Colonel Luzon, Don Rodrigo Lasso, Don Sebastian Zapata, gentlemen volunteers, Don Antonio Manrique, Don Diego de Luzon, Don Beltran del Salto, Don Geronimo de Aybar, Juan de Guzman, Don Garcia Manrique, and the Chaplain-General, Vicar of the Shoeless Carmelites at Lisbon, and other officers. The soldiers were placed a short distance away, quite naked, and so we passed the night. At daybreak next morning the enemy came and separated from us the other officers, and placed them also inside the square. The soldiers were then taken into an open field near, and a line of the enemy's harquebusiers approached us on one side, and a body of cavalry on the other, killing over 300 of us by lance and bullet. About 150 of us managed to escape across the bog, many of us wounded, and fled to the bishop's castle. The bishop sheltered us, and sent those who were not wounded, about 100, to the isles of Hibernia (Hebrides).[1] We who were wounded remained in the Castle, but many of our number died every day. We were then sent with a guide to the house of a savage gentleman named O'Kane, where we remained three days, both he and his people showing us great kindness in our sufferings, feeding, and tending us, hand and foot. On the fourth day we were sent with another guide to another O'Kane, his brother, twelve miles from there. The day after our arrival mass was said for us, but this was an exception in our honour, as they usually have mass only once a week. In three days we were sent with another guide and letters to a gentleman named Sorley-boy, begging him to give us boats, as we were good Catholics like himself. This gentleman owned vessels, as he lived on an arm of the sea [he was the famous Sorleyboy McDonnell, Lord of Dunluce, the beautiful castle near the Giant's Causeway]. He received us with great kindness, and kept us twenty days, mass being said for us. There were no boats there at the time ; but he sent for some three miles off [probably to the joint lord of the route, McQuillan, his neighbour]. Two boats

[1] September 26, Fox to Walsingham : ' Many of the Spaniards stripped naked by Hovenden's troops have been sent to McSweeny by the bishop of Derry.'

came, and eighty soldiers were embarked in them, to be taken to an island of Scotland ten miles away, the rest remaining in the castle until the boats' return. In the meanwhile the Governor in Dublin had learnt that this gentleman had sheltered Spaniards; and had sent to tell him in the Queen's name not to help any more on pain of death and confiscation. He was also ordered to surrender to the English those he now had with him. He replied that he would rather lose his life and gear and his wife and children too, than barter Christian blood. He had, he said, devoted his sword to the defence of the Catholic faith and those who held it; and in spite of the Governor, the Queen, and all the English, he would succour and embark the Spaniards who came to him in trouble. And he came back to us Spaniards with tears in his eyes, and told us the answer he had sent to the Queen's Governor's demand. So when the boats came back he shipped the rest.'

I am sorry that time forbids me to continue the story of these men in their passage through Scotland, and on their voyage to Flanders, where very few, only thirty-two of them, eventually arrived late in December 1588. But I may say that Sorleyboy was as good as his word; and the Lord Deputy wrote to the Queen's Council that he had shipped in all not less than 400 Spaniards from Dunluce to Scotland. The Colonel Luzon, Don Rodrigo Lasso, and the rest of the officers who were thought worth ransom, with whose names I will not now trouble you, were marched to Drogheda, several dying of want and fatigue on the way. The examination of the Colonel will be found in the Calendar of Irish State Papers, where he repeats his complaint of the treatment to which his men had been subjected. It will be well for a moment to glance at the English version of the story as told in the Irish State Papers. On September 8 Hovenden writes from Bert Castle, O'Dogherty's principal fortress, that O'Dogherty had sent him word that Luzon with 600 men had landed, and marched inland to within twelve miles of him. Hovenden had, he says, only 150 men. He

was uncertain of the loyalty of the country, and doubted even Tyrone and O'Dogherty's good faith. On the 14th, a few days after the fight, he writes again to the Viceroy from Dungannon, saying he had taken all the Spaniards prisoners, but nothing about the massacre. The hideous carnage of defenceless men cannot be defended; but a glance at the condition of Ireland at the time will at least enable us to understand it. Tyrone was biding his time; but the English knew that he was crouching to spring. The other great Ulsterman, O'Donnell, and his fierce Scottish wife were held in check only because their son and heir was a hostage in Dublin Castle; but his great vassal, McSweeny, in Donegal, was receiving the wrecked Spaniards with open arms. O'Rourke, in North Connaught, and his vassal chiefs were in open defiance. News came from all points of the coast that Spanish ships were seen everywhere—seven in the Shannon, four in Galway Bay, three in Dingle, seven on the coast of Donegal, and so on. Bingham, the President of Connaught, thought that this was a new fleet from Spain sent to capture Ireland. The Viceroy wrote later that if only 1,000 fresh Spaniards with ammunition had come at this time the Queen would have lost Ireland, for the whole country would have joined them, and there was no English force to resist them. A perusal of the Calendar of Irish State Papers of the time will show that the position was really critical, and the English thought it was much worse than it really was. They did not know then that the Spanish ships were leaking like sieves, that the water on board of them was stinking, the food rotten, all heart and spirit gone from the men, who were dying of starvation and hardship, and above all, with the knowledge of helpless, hopeless, crushing disaster. So the order went forth to slay and spare not. Of all the 600 men from the 'Valenzera,' only Luzon and two other nobles were ultimately rescued (besides those whose escape I have described), and they remained in London for over two years before they were exchanged.

About the same time as the 'Valenzera' was wrecked, the great flagship 'Gran Grin,' 1,160 tons, with over 300 men on

board, went ashore on the terrible Clare island. One hundred men struggled ashore, and Dowdragh O'Malley killed them all as they landed. Amongst them was the brother of a great noble, Don Pedro de Mendoza. Bingham was quite vexed with his subordinate that he had not saved him for ransom. Sir R. Bingham, writing on September 21, says that his brother had killed 700 Spaniards in Ulster alone. The 'Falcon Blanco Mediano' had shortly before gone ashore on the coast of Galway. She must have had about 100 men on her; yet Bingham writes that he has only kept two, Don Luis de Cordoba and his nephew Don Felipe, who were nobles and could pay ransom. In the same letter to the Viceroy he says that at least 6,000 or 7,000 men had perished in the fifteen or sixteen ships that had been wrecked on his province of Connaught; but this was an over-estimate. Only twelve ships had been lost there. There were not nearly so many men on the Spanish ships as English accounts state. And so, says Bingham, God be thanked, this province stands clear of foreign enemies save a few poor silly prisoners, unless O'Rourke do keep any contrary to the order. A week later Bingham writes to Walsingham that 1,000 Spaniards in all had landed from the wrecks in his province of Connaught, 'which since were all put to the sword.'

The dangerous point was the Bay of Donegal. Munster had been crushed at the Desmond rebellion nine years before. Ormond and the Burkes in South Connaught were loyal, but the Ulstermen were rebels at heart, only waiting for Tyrone's signal. At Ballyshannon, the head of Donegal Bay, the territory of O'Rourke joined that of O'Donnell; and if Spaniards landed there or at Sligo in force, and a junction was effected between O'Rourke's chiefs and O'Donnell's great vassal McSweeny in South Donegal, England's hold upon Ireland outside the Pale was gone, for all Ulster and Connaught would join them. Donegal Bay was therefore the key of Ireland; and yet as if by an adverse fate it was here that the sorely beset Spanish galleons which had not been able to work far enough to the west were embayed and unable to

get clear, in the face of the heavy S.W. gales. The English thought they had come there by design, and acted accordingly. Here there was no mercy. A ship, which I suspect was the 'Juliana,' went ashore somewhere near Downpatrick Head, every man from which was killed, one Irish gallowglas despatching eighty with his axe; William Burke, of Ardenrie, taking sixty-nine alive, who were subsequently put to the sword.

So when, on September 9, three great ships were seen at the entrance of Sligo Bay, the word was given on shore for blood and plunder. The ships were the 'San Juan,' with Don Diego Enriquez on board, with many other fine gentlemen, another great galleon, the 'San Juan Bautista,' and probably the 'San Juan de Sicilia.' The number of men on board these three ships must have approached 1,300. The great ships looked formidable, but they really were battered leaking wrecks, and all the crews were dying of scurvy and starvation. I will spare you the terrible story of their sufferings before they appeared at Sligo and commence the story from there. On board the 'San Juan de Sicilia' there was a Captain Francisco Cuellar, who had been condemned to be hanged, with another captain, for allowing their hulks to outsail the galleon of the Duke of Medina in the North Sea. The other captain was hanged from the yardarm, but Cuellar was saved by the intercession of Don Martin de Aranda, the Auditor-General, who was on board the 'San Juan de Sicilia,' and henceforward Cuellar sailed in that ship. He was a true son of Andalusia—a born story-teller—and he left behind him, written when he arrived in Flanders, the most vivid and entertaining account of his extraordinary, almost incredible, adventures, full of humour, observation, and force. This document is also in the Academy of History at Madrid, and is printed in Spanish by Captain Fernandez Duro, from whose book a short summary of it was given by Mr. Froude in his Spanish story of the 'Armada.'[1] Time will only allow me to give a few extracts

[1] Since this paper was read I believe two English translations of Captain Cuellar's narrative have been published.

from this curious paper. The three great ships anchored half a league from land in the vain hope of getting food and succour. A heavy sea was running, and after they had ridden at anchor four days, a great westerly gale came, tore the ships from their moorings, and drove all three into a little bay surrounded by great jagged rocks, such as Cuellar had never seen before. In an hour the three great galleons were smashed to bits, and two months afterwards the Viceroy himself described the great wreckage piled up—'more,' he says, 'than sufficient to build five of the biggest ships he ever saw.' A thousand men, says Cuellar, were drowned, and 300 somehow got ashore. Cuellar describes the sad fate of Don Diego Enriquez and three other nobles. They took their ship's boat, and with 16,000 ducats and their fine jewels, went below and had the hatch caulked down. Then with 70 poor wretches crowded on the little deck they launched it in the boiling surf. But it was overloaded and top-heavy. A great roller turned it upside down and made sport of it, and at last threw it bottom upmost on the beach with the nobles suffocated inside with their treasure. Cuellar's ship had broken in two, and he says: 'I commended myself to God and our Lady, and from the top of the poop I looked upon the great scene of sorrow around me. Many were drowning on board the ships. Others cast themselves into the sea to appear no more; others cried loudly to God, and officers were casting their gold chains and money into the waters. Waves were sweeping over the decks, dragging men back as they receded. And as I looked well at this festival I was at a loss what to do, for I could not swim, the waves being heavy, and the beach lined with enemies dancing and jumping with pleasure at our distress; and as soon as any man reached the shore, hundreds of savages and other enemies cast themselves upon him, and stripped him to the skin without pity, and then brutally wounded the poor naked creatures. The Auditor-General—God forgive him—came to me in tribulation, full of tears, and I told him we must save our lives before the ship broke up, as it could not stand

another quarter of an hour, and all the officers and most of the men were already drowned.' Cuellar then recounts how they got on to a floating spar, the Auditor weighted with doubloons sewn up in his doublet and trunks. He, with his gold, was soon swept away, crying upon God to save him as he sank. 'I,' says Cuellar, 'called upon our Lady of Ontañar, and three or four waves one after the other, I know not how, drove me ashore.' His leg had been crushed with a spar; he could not stand and was covered with blood, so the savages and enemies who were busy stripping those who swam ashore, seeing him with only linen clothes on, and in an apparently dying state, took no notice of him. He dragged himself along, meeting many naked Spaniards shivering with cold and terror, until at nightfall he lay down on rushes in a field, wet through, and worn out with pain and hunger. 'Soon,' he says, 'there approached me a fair young gentleman, stark naked, so frightened that he could not speak even to tell me who he was. It was nine at night, and the weather was moderating; we were dying with hunger, when two armed men, one with a great axe in his hand, discovered us. We said not a word, but they looked with pity upon us, and cut a lot of rushes and grass, covering us up well, but without speaking, and then went off to the beach to plunder, with 2,000 other savages, and some English from a fortress near' (Sligo, no doubt). The next morning Cuellar found his companion dead by his side. He limped to a monastery near, but found it desecrated and ruined, with Spaniards hanging by the neck from the rafters. After this Cuellar says his adventures sound more like a book of chivalry than sober truth, and so they do. A poor old savage Irish woman in tears warned him away from the village where she lived, as it was full of Sassenachs who had slaughtered many Spaniards, so he lurked about the thickets overlooking the beach again. Some naked, wounded Spanish soldiers came crying to him in abject terror, and told him how the enemies had killed 100 of their companions. Then, he says, 'God gave me strength, for I cried upon Him and His blessed

Mother, and said to the soldiers, "Let us go down to the beach where the men are plundering; perhaps we shall find something to eat or drink," for I was perishing with hunger. We went, and came across many dead bodies being cast up by the sea, sad and dreadful to see, for we knew many of them, and there were over 400 strewn on the beach. (Shortly afterwards an English observer says he counted 1,100 bodies here on three miles of beach, and the Viceroy speaks of 1,300 being seen.) They recognised the body of Don Pedro Enriquez and that of another officer, a friend of Cuellar's, and as they were scratching a hole in the sand to bury them away from crows and wolves, a large horde of savages came towards them; but, seeing their occupation, left them. Then some armed men came, and were about to strip and kill Cuellar, when a man in some authority rescued him. He then wandered off alone again, but fell in with an English soldier, a Frenchman, and some Irishmen. They wounded him and plundered him of everything he possessed, and would have killed him but for a beautiful Irish girl, who he thought was the lover of the English soldier. He was worth plundering, for he had a fine gold chain under his shirt worth 1,000 reals, and 45 gold ducats, two months' pay, in his pocket, but he most regretted some sacred relics and a miniature habit of the Holy Trinity he wore round his neck, which were taken by the girl in exchange for her care of him. 'She told me she was a Christian, but she was as much a Christian as Mahomet.' And so, lurking in the woods and mountains, quite naked now, and not worth plundering, with a few broken words of Latin, the Irish passed him from one to the other, whispering him to avoid the Sassenach. Hiding in barns, tended now and again by pitying women, he toiled onward through incredible sufferings and vicissitudes towards the mountains behind Sligo, where they told him lay the lands of the great O'Rourke. At last, with ferns and hay-bands for his only garment, he found himself with 20 other Spaniards in one of O'Rourke's villages, where some rough hospitality, but not much, was shown them, for O'Rourke

himself was away. Soon came news that there was a Spanish ship on the coast, and they all started off in the hope of getting on board of her. Cuellar, wounded and weak, fainted by the way; his companions reached the ship, joined her; she was afterwards lost with all hands, and he alone of them survived. Mr. Froude thought this ship was the galleass 'Girona,' at Killibegs, but in this he was mistaken. Soon Cuellar fell in with a disguised priest who spoke Latin. He told him of a savage chief, a valiant warrior and great enemy of the English, who lived in a strong fortress 18 miles off. Cuellar was dead lame, starved, and weak, but he started to the place indicated. He suffered countless tribulations, amongst which was that a savage Irish blacksmith, with an 'ugly accursed old woman' for a wife, enslaved him, and kept him at the forge, until his friend, the disguised priest, appeared and rescued him. At length he arrived at the castle of Manglana, standing in a lake, on the near side of which was a village and a bog. This place has, I believe, never been identified authoritatively, but it certainly was situated on Lake Melvin, which was held by the McGlannogh, a vassal chief of O'Rourke.[1] Here, for a time, I will let Cuellar speak for himself. 'When he saw me, he and all his people were filled with pity, and the women even wept to see me so maltreated; for I was only covered by a straw garment. They did the best they could for me, giving me an Irish mantle such as they wear, swarming with vermin, and so I stayed three months with them, looking just as savage as they. The wife of my master was extremely beautiful, and was very kind to me. One day we were sitting in the sun with her family and women around her, and they asked me about Spain. At last one of them begged me to look at their palms and tell their fortunes. I thanked God for this, for I thought surely this

[1] Since this paper was read I have received from an esteemed correspondent in Dublin, Dr. Fraser, an interesting account of this castle, a considerable portion of which is still standing. The bog on the near shore of the lake has now disappeared, but the land lies low, and bears indications of having formerly been a swamp. The position of the castle exactly agrees with that given by Cuellar.

was the last thing that could happen to me, to be turned into a gipsy amongst savages. But I looked at all their hands and told them a lot of nonsense, at which they were delighted. I was the best Spaniard in the world.' His popularity then became so great that he was pestered day and night by people who wanted their fortunes told; and at last he had to appeal for protection to McGlannogh himself and ask for shelter within the castle. This McGlannogh gave him, ordering that he was not to be importuned any more. This is his description of the Irish: 'These savages live like brutes in the mountains, which are very rugged in this part of Ireland. They live in straw huts, and are big men with handsome faces and fine limbs, as swift as greyhounds. They only eat once a day at night, their usual food being butter with oaten bread and their drink sour milk, which is all they have to drink, except water, which is the best in the world, but they do not drink it. At their feasts they eat some half-cooked meat without bread or salt. They dress in tight brogues and short tunics of thick skin which they cover with a mantle. They wear their hair down to their eyes. They are great walkers and very hardy. They are constantly at war with the English garrison, whom they do not allow to enter their lands, which consist of swamps and bogs for 40 leagues in length. Their nature is to be robbers and steal from one another, so that hardly a day passes without an alarm being sounded. As soon as one tribe learns that the other has any cattle, they come at night to steal it, and then there is the devil to pay. Then the English come and take it away from those who have stolen it, and these have to fly to the mountains with their women and cattle, for they have no other gear. They sleep on rushes fresh cut, damp and cold. Most of the women are very handsome, but badly attired. They only dress in a shirt and a mantle, and cover their heads with a thick linen cloth fastened on the forehead. They are very industrious and good housewives in their way. They call themselves Christians and follow the Roman faith, but the English have destroyed most of their churches and monas-

teries. These savages liked us, because we were the enemies of the heretics, and if it had not been for them not a soul of us would have escaped, though they were the first to strip and plunder us when we landed, and gained great riches from the 13 ships that were wrecked here.'

But the Viceroy was determined, as he wrote to the Council, to make a riddance of the Spaniards scattered in great numbers through North Connaught and Donegal, and started with a large force early in November. From chief to chief ran the news. McGlannogh stopped the English spies going to Ballyshannon, but sent word to McSweeny to get rid of the large force of Spaniards who were with him. McGlannogh himself came to Cuellar in great grief, and said that he and his tribe must take to the mountains, for the English were coming, and Cuellar and the eight Spanish soldiers with him must fly. But Cuellar, as he himself tells the story, volunteered with his eight companions to hold the castle against all the force of England. McGlannogh was delighted but incredulous. He put the little Spanish garrison into his castle with provisions for six months, whilst he and his people fled to the mountains, whither the English could not follow. According to Cuellar, the Viceroy came down with his force to besiege the castle but could do nothing because the bog on the near side of the lake prevented him from getting within range. So the Spaniards derided him from the walls until the snow and bad weather drove him away. Fitzwilliam himself says nothing of this, only that he has cleared the land of Spaniards, 'except about 100 miserable, ragged, or naked creatures utterly spoiled by the Irishry scattered about Ulster, to whom he has offered the Queen's mercy and of whom twenty had already come in by the end of the year.' When McGlannogh came back to find his castle safe, his delight was beyond bounds and he would have kept his Spanish bodyguard for good. Cuellar was restless to get away, and one of the kerns told him that McGlannogh was going to shut him up in a dungeon, so that he should not leave him. So on January 4, 1589, with four other soldiers,

he set out before dawn and escaped. Twenty days of incredible sufferings brought him to the land of O'Kane, Prince of Derry. Before he reached the town he fell dead lame, and the savages hid him from the English, of whom there were many in the place. At last, whilst he was making love to an Irish girl, two English soldiers came in on the same errand and caught him. How the women again contrived his escape, and how, after wondrous wanderings, he arrived at the castle of Redmund O'Gallagher, Bishop of Derry, on Lough Foyle, and how he escaped through countless perils to Scotland, and thence to Flanders, I have no time to tell, but we may be sure that Captain Cuellar told the story often enough to gaping listeners in sunny Spain for the rest of his life I have left myself but little space to say anything of other wrecks, but I must mention the fate of one gallant Spaniard who gave more anxiety to the English than all the rest put together. The most popular man on the Armada was a great noble named Don Alonso de Leyva, who secretly bore a commission to take the supreme command in case of the Duke of Medina's illness or death. He was on board a fine vessel of 800 tons called the 'Rata Coronada,' with 400 men and the flower of the young chivalry of Spain. When the news of the disasters in Ireland reached Philip bit by bit through the winter, he wrote on the margins of the papers constant inquiries as to the fate of Leyva and his companions. Then he got intelligence that Leyva had landed with a large force of Spaniards—the numbers stated varying from 1,000 to 4,000—that he had fortified himself, that he had conquered the English, that he had surrendered, and so forth, from spies in England, Flanders, and France. Philip in the meanwhile was imploring that definite news should be sent to him in order that he might know what to do. If he had only known, this was his opportunity. The Viceroy himself told the Council that if a single shipload of men and ammunition had been sent to Leyva from Spain, Ireland would have been lost. English accounts are as confused as the Spanish as to Leyva's movements, the only point upon which they are

agreed being the circumstances of his ultimate loss. I have been fortunate enough to find a short but circumstantial statement made by one of the nine sailors who were saved, which supplies the connecting links, and we now know really what occurred. Reading this statement in connection with the confession of an Irish sailor from the Armada to the Viceroy, now in the Irish State Papers, it is evident that the 'Rata Coronada' found herself on September 10 off the extreme N.W. point of Mayo sorely distressed, without eatable food or drinkable water. Leyva decided to risk everything to obtain supplies. He put into Broad Haven, and landed some of his men. The next day a hulk called the 'Duquesa St. Ana,' 900 tons, came in on a similar errand. The 'Rata' was moored by a single cable. The current was strong and she dragged her anchor. Another cable was fastened to a rock, but it snapped and the ship drifted ashore. Leyva landed his men and arms, and a small gun, and took possession of a tower on the shore whilst a supply of fresh water and such poor provisions as the sterile country afforded were shipped on the 'St. Ana,' and before Bingham could take steps to dislodge him he sailed for Spain on the 'St. Ana,' setting fire to the 'Rata,' but ineffectually, for Comerford informs Bingham that great plunder of gold, silver, and rich stuffs were taken from the wreck by the Irish. But the unfortunate 'Duquesa St. Ana' had no sooner passed the Mullett headland than she was met by a furious south-west gale, which drove her back into Loghros Bay in South-west Donegal, where she went ashore. Leyva again landed the combined companies to the number of about 700, and found on shore a number more men from another ship that had also been wrecked near (which I believe to have been 'La Via'). Here he again fortified himself in the country of McSweeny Bannagh. But runners soon brought news that nineteen miles off, in McSweeny ne Doe's fine harbour of Killibegs, a large company of Spaniards were collected, and that the great galleass 'Girona,' battered, but still capable of sailing, was in the bay. Leyva himself was disabled with a wound,

but was carried in a chair, and with all his company went to the country of McSweeny ne Doe, a firm friend of the Spaniards. Here he found himself with over 2,000 armed men, and determined to fortify himself, and await reinforcements from Spain. This was the great danger for the English. All South Donegal belonged to McSweeny, and he was in touch with O'Rourke, whose young son had run away from Oxford University, and with a few hundred kerns was holding the passes. O'Rourke himself sent 500 beeves to McSweeny's country to feed the Spaniards. There were no English troops in Ireland to resist such a force as this, and the north began to ferment. O'Donnell's wife threatened vengeance unless her son were released. Tirlogh Lenogh O'Neil sought the aid of the Spaniards to raise Ulster against Tyrone, and the English knew not whom they could trust, even the Hovendens and Kelly being doubted. False and exaggerated news, too, came of the movements of the Spaniards. Geoffrey Fenton in a panic seized Sligo Castle, as he said to keep the Spaniards out; they were marching, he said, to the number of 2,000 by Ballyshannon over Lough Erne, to attack him. It was not true, and his fears were groundless, but doubtless some hundreds of Spaniards went that way to join O'Rourke. Fitzwilliam could only muster about 800 men, and begged the Queen to send him reinforcements and ships. But he was stout-hearted and started on November 4 from Dublin with the small force he could muster to sweep the country clear of Spaniards. His energy won the day. Flying spies told of his coming. The Irish were not united, the day of the great Ulstermen Tyrone and O'Donnell was not yet. McSweeny could not stand against the English unsupported by his own prince O'Donnell, so Leyva shipped 1,500 men on the galleass, more than she would properly hold, leaving the rest to shift for themselves, and sailed for Scotland, where he hoped to get help. The galleass was crazy and had a broken rudder, but with a fair south-west wind she doubled the north of Ireland and got into St. George's Channel. Then the

pilots told Leyva that the wind was fair and they would run him to Spain in five days. He consented, but the wind suddenly shifted to a south-east hurricane and he was driven back again. On Bonboy's rock hard by the Giant's Causeway the galleass 'Girona' met her doom, only nine men out of the 1,500 being saved. Sorleyboy McDonnell of Dunluce waxed rich with the wine and wreckage that drifted ashore, and the plunder of gold chains and doubloons on the corpses repaid him for his humanity to the hundreds of Spaniards he had aided.

Fitzwilliam told the Queen on the last day of the year that all Ireland was free of Spaniards, except a few naked stragglers, but many certainly stayed with O'Rourke; and I have seen a petition dated as late as 1596 from eight of the soldiers, begging Philip to send them aid to return to Spain, they having remained in the service of O'Donnell since the Armada. In addition to the ships I have mentioned, the 'San Marcos' was burnt by the Spaniards in the Shannon, at Carrig na Cowly, and her men saved in another ship. Admiral Recalde burnt another, 'San Juan,' in Dingle Bay, the men being saved, and at the same time and place the 'Nuestra Señora de la Rosa' sank at her moorings, every soul on board perishing but one, and he gave a statement afterwards full of lies to the English (Irish State Papers). I have tried to show that, much as we may condemn the cruelty in Connaught to gallant and defenceless enemies, there were circumstances that explain it. But in Munster there was no danger, for Munster had been crushed nine years before, yet there, but for a different reason, the cruelty was as great. On September 7 one of the small hoys of the Armada put into the Bay of Tralee, without water or food, utterly beaten by tempest. Three of the men swam ashore, and threw themselves and their companions, twenty-four in all, upon the mercy of Lady Denny, to whom they surrendered their ship. When the twenty-four had landed, Sir Edward Denny had all their throats cut—every one. The Vice-President of Munster, Thomas Norris, wrote to Walsingham the day after

regretting this, but saying there was no safe keeping for them. This was absurd, and not the true explanation. The common talk amongst Denny's friends was, and it was repeated by all the Spanish spies, that Denny had a special personal grudge against the Spaniards. I happen to know what this grudge was.

In 1579, when the Spanish Papal force, well-nigh one thousand men, had surrendered to Grey, at Smerwick, on promise of their lives, the throats of all but a few officers were treacherously cut; the chivalrous Raleigh being one of those who helped in the slaughter, and the gentle poet Spenser looking on with approval. The commander of the Papal force, Colonel Sebastiano di San Giuseppe, fell to Denny's share to be held for ransom, and Denny kept him for three years in expectation of a rich reward. But Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador, found means to bribe the keeper, and the colonel escaped. Denny swore a great oath that he would be revenged upon Mendoza by killing every Spaniard he came across—and he kept his word. This alone will show how widely different are our present thoughts and feelings from those prevalent then, and warns us that it is not safe to judge what seems the heartless cruelty of the sixteenth century by the gentler humanitarian code of the nineteenth.

ELIZABETHAN VILLAGE SURVEYS.

By W. J. CORBETT, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read April 29, 1897

THE object of the present paper is to call attention to a class of documents which seem hitherto to have escaped much notice from economic historians, but which, it is thought, may throw light on the agrarian transitions which took place in England during the sixteenth century. The documents in question date from the reign of Elizabeth, and are termed by their compilers *Libri supervisionis*, or surveys.[1] An examination of their contents shows that the name is justly applied; for they are not merely rentals or terriers, such as landowners in all ages have frequently compiled as evidence of the value or extent of their estates, but elaborate topographical descriptions, furlong by furlong, and strip by strip, of complete villages, extending sometimes in length to a hundred pages of manuscript. Herein lies their interest; for, as the surveys are not confined to particular estates or particular manors, but make the complete circuit of the villages, giving the abuttals and compass bearings of the various parcels of land, only patience and ingenuity are required to compile a tolerably accurate map of each village as it was at the date of the surveyor's visit; and Elizabethan maps are not of such every day occurrence as to render their recovery a matter of indifference. Of course in some cases owing either to ignorance of the size and shape of the wastes, or to the complete obliteration of old landmarks by parliamentary enclosures, it may be difficult to compile a map; but even in these cases the surveys themselves cannot fail to be illuminating, containing as they do a detailed statement of the arrangements of each village such as can nowhere else

[1] One of the surveys terms itself a 'Dragga.'

be obtained. For instance, they enable us to speak with certainty as to who were the owners of land in each village, what was the extent of each estate, and how far the holdings were scattered throughout the common fields, or consolidated in ring fences. Further, in many cases we get complete information as to the comparative extent and position of the freeholds and copyholds, as to the proportion of arable to wood and pasture, as to the position and extent of the demesnes and glebes, as to the number of messuages and cottages, and as to the way in which the different manors were intermixed. In some cases, too, appended to the actual surveys there follow the customs of the manor and one or more rentals; while I have found one rental supplemented with an elaborate attempt to trace the descent of all the copyholds, through the entries in the Court rolls, from the first year of Edward IV. down to the year the survey was taken. The range of topics dealt with by the surveys then is by no means small, but probably the most interesting and useful facts contained in them will be found to be the evidence which their pages preserve as to the amount of enclosing that had been going on. I shall accordingly devote a large part of this paper to examining their contents particularly from this point of view.

The particular examples of village surveys, dating from Elizabethan times, that I have had the opportunity of examining all come from the muniment room at King's College, Cambridge, and for the most part deal with lands in Norfolk; but I have little doubt that King's College was not peculiar in this matter, and that a search in other college muniment rooms, or among the archives of other large landowners, would reveal the existence of similar surveys, so that specimens for most parts of England may eventually be expected to turn up. Indeed I have already seen another Norfolk specimen,[1] similar in all respects to those belonging

[1] This survey deals with Forncett and the neighbouring villages into which the manor of Forncett extended. My attention was drawn to it by Miss Frances G. Davenport.

to King's College, and of about the same date, which was made for the Duke of Norfolk and which is now in the possession of Mr. A. C. Cole. I have already said that primarily the merit of the surveys is that they deal with complete villages; it may therefore be as well to explain that, in addition to the complete surveys, the descriptions often cover parts of other villages as well, this method being adopted whenever the chief manor described was not contained entirely within the boundaries of a single township, a frequent occurrence in Norfolk. The number of villages, therefore, about which I have found some information is much larger than the number of surveys. The following table will show more clearly than any description the amount of material that I have come across, the dates of the various documents, their numbers in the muniment catalogue, and their comparative length, roughly speaking, in pages of manuscript. It also will show which of the villages are completely and which incompletely surveyed.

A. Complete Surveys.

Date.	County.	Township.	Length of MS.	Press Mark.
			Pages.	
1564	Norfolk	Coltishall	28	E. 25, viii.
,,	,,	Horstead	35	,,
,,	,,	Staninghall	16	,,
1565	Middlesex	Ruislip	41	R. 36
1566	Norfolk	Toft Monks	64	Y. i. 20
1584	,,	Lessingham	70	P. 34
,,	,,	Hempstead	116	,,
,,	,,	Coltishall	91	E. 28
1586	,,	Horstead	87	N. 52
,,	,,	Staninghall	9	,,
Undated.	Cambridgeshire	Coton	38	K. 90

B. Partial Surveys.

1566	Norfolk	Hadiscoe	—[1]	Y. i. 20
1572	,,	Crostwick	18	N. 52
1579	,,	Frettenham	15	,,
1584	,,	Happisburgh	17	P. 34
,,	,,	Ingham	2	,,
,,	,,	Eccles-by-the-Sea	6	,,
1585	,,	Belaugh	17	E. 28
1586	,,	Great Hautbois	5	,,
1587	,,	Scottow	18	,,

[1] Intermixed with the survey of Toft Monks.

It will be seen that, in all, the surveys cover some 700 pages of manuscript, some well written, others very badly, exclusive of several hundred more pages devoted to the rentals. Consequently it is no light task to digest the mass of details which they embody, and I may as well state at once that I in no way claim to have done so. For instance, I have only superficially glanced through the surveys of Ruislip, in Middlesex, and Coton, in Cambridgeshire, and have confined all detailed study to the Norfolk villages, the reason being that I have lived in Norfolk and am personally acquainted with Horstead and Lessingham. Even so, I have not been able to complete the compilation of the maps with as much thoroughness as I should like, and can only claim to have thoroughly studied Hempstead, Lessingham, and Horstead. The first two I selected because they are small in area and easily dealt with, and the latter because it is my own home, and because there happen to be two surveys of it—one for the year 1564, and the other for 1586. For Horstead, too, I have found a number of supplementary documents relating to the enclosing of the wastes in 1599, so that altogether I know more about this village than any other, and can trace the changes occurring in it between 1564 and 1600 with some certainty.

With these few words of preface I turn now to the documents themselves, and to what I have learnt from them; and I will begin first of all with a few observations on the various technical terms used in them for describing the agricultural arrangements of different localities.

Generally speaking the surveys are all very much alike in form—that is to say, they pay very little attention to the old fields (*campi*), and treat the furlongs as the units that have to be surveyed. For convenience the fullest surveys, before describing the furlongs, begin by dividing the town up into subdivisions with the title of 'precincts,' each bounded by the chief roads, but it is clear that neither the fields nor the precincts had any agricultural significance, and so for our purpose they may both be neglected. I may remark, however,

Explanation of Colouring.

...ht red.	*Ancient arable land still lying in open fields.*
...k red.	*Ancient arable land recently enclosed.*
...ow.	*Arable land approved from the waste before the 16th century.*
...k Green.	*Common wastes existing in 1586, but enclosed by agreement in 1599*
...t Green.	*Pasture, meadow, and woodland held in severalty.*
●	*Messuages and cottages.* —— *Boundaries of Furlongs.*

Malby & Sons Lith.

of is a difference between the Norfolk nomenclature and that of the other counties, which may imply a difference of agricultural practice. Whereas in Norfolk the strips are always called 'pieces,' and are described as bounded by 'metae,' at Ruislip, in Middlesex, we read of 'seliones,' and at Coton, in Cambridgeshire, of 'lands.' So far as I have noticed, too, in these latter cases there is no mention of the 'metae,' which in Norfolk were not merely ideal limits but real boundaries, for we hear of cases where they had been ploughed up. It is possible then that the Norfolk strips were not identical in character with the selions further west, but were flat parcels of land bounded by what economic historians have called 'balks'; while the selions perhaps had no such bounds, for they were sufficiently differentiated from each other by their ridged or heaped-up form. Anyhow, whether or not this suggestion is correct, it seems advisable to point out that the term 'balk,' as used in the Coton survey, does not mean a mere division between strips, as might have been supposed. On the contrary, the balks which are mentioned are of rare occurrence, and seem to be comparable with the selion or 'land' in size, to be in fact rather unmetalled roadways than mere boundaries between strips. The following extract from the Coton survey will perhaps make clear what I mean, and show why I think the 'lands' may not have been divided at all, or if so certainly not usually by 'balks,' of the kind mentioned by the survey:—

Coton Survey.

Item.—3 lands, containing 1 acre, the Rector.
Item.—2 lands, containing 3 roods, King's College.
Item.—A balk.
Item.—6 lands, containing 2 acres, St. Catharine's Hall.
Item.—A balk.
Item.—2 lands, containing 3 roods, St. John's College.
Item.—6 lands, containing 7 roods, St. Catharine's Hall.

After this no more balks occur for some time; but when they do occur, they are sometimes distinguished as great and little balks, or as 'common' balks.

The above extract will also serve to show the real meaning of the term 'land' or selio, and how it is not by any means the same thing as an acre strip, or even a half acre. Apparently it varies between a rood and half an acre; but it is not common either for two lands or for four lands to go to an acre for many consecutive strips in any furlong. In Norfolk the pieces (as they are called) vary in size considerably; many of the 'pieces,' in fact, are not strips at all, but large blocks of land containing many acres. Still, even excluding these, there remains considerable variety, pieces of all sizes, from five acres down to a rood, being plentiful. On the whole I should say that strips of less than an acre predominate in the furlongs nearest to the dwelling-houses and village streets, the furlongs on the outskirts of the village being in larger pieces, and having all the appearance of having been approved from the waste. But to this I shall return later. A few figures will perhaps make the matter clearer than any description. For example, at Hempstead 492 acres are surveyed as arable, and this is made up of 477 strips, only a few of which contain more than five acres, while on the other hand there were as many as 93 rood strips. In the portion of Belaugh surveyed there were even more strips than there are acres accounted for—namely, 204 strips to 160 acres. Lessingham, on the other hand, was not in such small strips; 209 strips are enumerated containing in all 450 acres. At Staninghall the proportion of strips to acres still further decreases, there being 89 strips to 300 acres. These figures, I think, give a fair idea of the general size of the pieces; it only remains to say that half roods are more frequent at Coton, in Cambridgeshire, than in any of the Norfolk villages, and the same applies to 'gore acres.'

I have remarked how the balk of Cambridgeshire appears to be a kind of way. Let us now turn to a Norfolk term which appears to have much the same significance. Ordinarily Norfolk lanes are called 'gates,' and footpaths not unfrequently 'styes' (German, '*Steg*'), but at times in these surveys we also meet with so-called 'meres.' These are evidently

thoroughfares of some kind, for we find the Water Mere at Toft Monks also described as the Water Gate, while *vice versâ* there are two ways, one in Hempstead and another in Coltishall, named Green Gate Mere. The only question is whether a mere, in addition to being a grass way, means anything else. I am not in a position to solve this point, as I have not yet met with many meres ; I cannot, however, help thinking that something underlies the name. The 'meres' that I have noted seem to be broad ways running in straight lines right through the old open fields, and not merely across single furlongs.[1]

To conclude this discussion of terms, I will just mention two others on whose meaning I should be glad to get some light. These are the 'hyrne' and the 'slade.' They both occur in the names of furlongs, but I have not been able to see why particular furlongs are given these designations. Neither term is common, and hyrnes seem to be confined to the outside edges of the old open fields.

Passing from the local phraseology to the actual agricultural arrangements set forth by these surveys, it seems natural to begin with the demesnes. How large were they and where were they situated in relation to other lands in the villages? To these questions no single answer can be given, as the arrangement varies from place to place. One thing is clear, however, and that is that the demesnes were small as compared to the total areas. Professor Ashley in his 'Economic History' speaks of the demesnes as occupying as a rule one-third of the arable area, but nothing like this is the case in any of the villages whose surveys I have examined. In Horstead 230 acres out of 1,600 were in demesnes, and 100 acres of these seem rather to be an approvement from the waste than really ancient arable. In Hempstead the proportion was 80 acres to 570. In Coltishall it was certainly

[1] A common name for a village lane in Norfolk is Margate, which often gets corrupted in 'Market,' and in Latin into *Mercatus*. This should not mislead anyone into supposing that there ever was a market in the village. I believe Margate is merely a corruption of Mere Gate.

no greater, and in Toft Monks considerably less. At Ruislip, in Middlesex, not a tenth of the arable was in demesne, but the survey does not give the acreage so I cannot give the accurate figures. Coton, in Cambridgeshire, I have not worked out.

The relative situation of the demesne lands may be thus described. At Ruislip and at Toft Monks it lay in compact blocks near the manor houses. At Lessingham it was contained in a single croft of 40 acres. At Hempstead, on the other hand, it lay scattered in strips of various sizes in the field. At Horstead, Coltishall, and Staninghall some of it was in blocks and some in strips. The rental for Horstead further shows that originally it had been far more scattered, for much of the land held by the tenants in 1564 or 1586 is described as formerly demesne. For instance, the Hall Close, which in 1586 belonged entirely to the lords, had formerly had a number of strips in it belonging to tenants, which had been exchanged quite recently for demesne strips farther afield. The rental, too, rather shows that the demesne was contracting in area, for it notices several grants of demesne to hold as copyhold of recent date.

If it is asked how were the demesnes farmed, the answer in most cases appears to be by farmers with leases. The scattered strips of demesnes at Horstead, however, were not in the hands of the farmer, but in those of various tenants, and it is instructive to note that the latter means of cultivation has turned out disastrously from the point of view of the lords; for whereas all the larger areas, let on lease in Elizabeth's reign to farmers, still belong to the lords and produce substantial rents, all the smaller strips have irresistibly tended to get merged with the copyholds, and in Horstead have all passed out of the hands of the lord for good. The demesnes have consequently still further shrunk in area, and the rents which the lords might now be receiving are replaced by twopenny and threepenny quit rents not worth collecting.

Leaving the demesnes, we may next enquire as to the

number of the tenants, their rank in life, and the area of their estates. I have not worked this out properly for all the surveys, but I can give the facts for Horstead, Staninghall, Hempstead, and Lessingham approximately as they were in 1586–1588, and some general statements about Coltishall, and Toft Monks. A few tables will give the best comparative view of the cases I have worked out in detail.

HORSTEAD WITH STANINGHALL (area 2,746 acres).

(*a*) *Tenants mith messuages in the village.*

	Acres.		Acres.
1. J. Topliffe, gent.	280	10. R. Pightling	60
2. F. Woodhouse, Esq.	270	11. J. Rose	50
3. R. Ward, gent.	265	12. R. Lincoln	40
4. H. Shreve	180	13. W. Jeckell	20
5. A. Pightling, widow	120	14. W. Bulwer	20
6. W. Rose's heirs	110	15. E. Newerby, gent.	15
7. G, Berde	60	16. T. Barnard	12
8. A. Thetford, gent.	60[1]	17. E. Sparke	10
9. T. Pightling	60		

(*b*) *Tenants without messuages.*

	Acres.		Acres.
18. The Lord of Meyton	20	26. J. Hawkes	2
19. J. Stubbe, Esq.	10	27. W. Bayspool	2
20. J. Goffe	10	28. H. Spendelowe	1
21. N. Prenk	7	29. G. Yemmes	1
22. J. Brend	7	(*c*) *The Demesne*	230
23. Henry D'Oyley, Esq.	5	(*d*) *The Glebe* (Horstead)	55
24. G. Sotherton	3	(*d*) *The Glebe* (Staninghall)	29
25. J. Swift	3	(*e*) *The Town Lands*	7

HEMPSTEAD (area 907 acres).

(*a*) *Tenants with messuages.*

	Acres.		Acres.
1. W. Bishop	80	10. C. Ashley	10
2. W. Goscelin	75	11. O. Haylett	9
3. S. Hart	57	12. G. Suffield	9
4. J. Dereham	33	13. T. Kendall	7
5. H. Mitchell	27	14. C. Smith	6
6. J. Goscelin	19	15. C. Crane	5
7. W. Fenne	15	16. J. Miles	3
8. H. Hide	14	17. J. Gedney	3
9. T. Norfolk	12	18. W. Cobbe	¼

[1] This estate formed a sub-manor called 'Cattys.'

(*b*) *Tenants without messuages.*

	Acres.		Acres.
19. J. Frosdyke	7	23. J. Leame	$\frac{1}{4}$
20. T. Trace	3	(*c*) *Demesne*	80
21. E. Middleton	2	(*d*) *Glebe*	33
22. W. Porringer	$1\frac{1}{2}$		

LESSINGHAM (area 639 acres).

(*a*) *Tenants with messuages or cottages.*

	Acres.		Acres.
1. A. Cock, widow	62	11. R. Smith	11
2. J. Iddeson	45	12. J. Bowman	9
3. N. Crowe	41	13. E. Jackson, widow	9
4. E. Middleton	37	14. W. Bullock	6
5. T. Ball	37	15. M. Spooner	6
6. J. Dawson	33	16. T. Trace	5
7. W. Beare	24	17. H. Heylot	3
8. W. Heylot	21	18. N. Curtewick	1
9. W. Newton	20	19. R. Bexwell, miller	$\frac{1}{2}$
10. C. Free	18	20–25. 6 cottagers	1

(*b*) *Tenants without messuages.*

	Acres.		Acres.
26. A. Joye, widow	7	(*c*) *Demesne*	40
27. The Lord of Ingham	6	(*d*) *Glebe*	9
28. A. Parminter, gent.	5		

The above tables show that there were still a considerable number of tenants in each village, and that on the whole the tenancies were small. A similar state of things existed at Toft Monks and Coltishall. At Toft there were at least twenty-five tenants with messuages and a great many more who had none, the total area being about 1,640 acres. At Coltishall, which contains about 1,200 acres, I have noted some seventeen tenants with messuages and four cottagers, and there may have been more. The incomplete surveys also tell the same story so far as they go. Only at Staninghall have I remarked anything different. I have included this with Horstead as they are surveyed together, but really the greater part of Staninghall is included in the 270 acres there assigned to F. Woodhouse. He in fact owned nearly all the cultivated area except the glebe, and his was the only

messuage. The arrangement, however, seems to be ancient and not due to recent evictions of smaller owners to any extent; for even in 'Domesday' it is recorded that Staninghall was owned by a single free man, whereas other villages in its neighbourhood are all returned as possessed by numbers of men. At Hempstead, for example, in 1086 there were as many as fifty.

It will be noticed that the tables do not say much about cottages or cottagers, presumably, therefore, the smaller men worked for the larger. The surveys, however, throw no light on this question, and many of the tenements entered as messuages must have been little better than cottages. As a rule the messuages in these Norfolk villages are not collected into streets, but lie scattered about along the various 'gates' or lanes. Many of the tenants, too, are recorded as occupying several messuages in different parts of the villages. In some cases, perhaps, the tenants did not really live in any of their messuages, for they are described in the rentals as citizens of Norwich. The parish registers, however, of Horstead which I have examined show that most of them were born and died in the place. It appears, therefore, more probable that these citizens were men who had retired from business and bought land. This seems confirmed by the fact that several of them were newcomers at Horstead between 1564 and 1586, and these newcomers are just the persons who appear most frequently on the Court rolls as exchanging strips of copyhold for the purpose of consolidating their tenancies.

A word should here be said about decayed messuages. One or two are certainly mentioned, and alike at Horstead, Coltishall, and Lessingham, the manor houses were no longer standing. The fact, however, already stated that many of the tenants had several messuages, and some quite close together, shows that as a rule the old farm buildings, even when needless, had been left standing.

Having spoken of the tenants, the next most natural enquiry to make is, how far were they of the freehold or copyhold class? As in so many other respects, the villages

are found to differ in this also. In Horstead and Coltishall the great bulk of the tenants all owned both freehold and copyhold. Even some of the very smallest occupiers held by both kinds of tenure, and the proportion between the two is as various as the size of the holdings. For a long time past, in fact, men had been buying and exchanging copyhold and freehold alike without distinction or preference, merely trying to acquire pieces, whatever their nature, which lay handy for their messuages.

Turn now to the manor of Lessingham, and we find something quite different. This manor was by no means coterminous with the township of the same name. It contained about 650 acres of arable, but 200 and more of them lay in Hempstead, and some in other villages. Now according to the evidence of our survey, none of the 400 acres in Lessingham were freehold, and only two acres of those in Hempstead. The freeholds all told were quite insignificant, and consisted of a few outlying pieces situated in Ingham, Brumstead, and Happisburgh. The majority, therefore, in fact nearly all the tenants of Lessingham manor, certainly all those living in the village, were copyholders only, and so quite unlike the tenants in Horstead or Coltishall. The explanation of this would seem to be that Lessingham was a very backward village; for, as I shall now proceed to show, it also differed from Horstead or Coltishall in still having large uncultivated wastes and in having few enclosures. Into the other villages I am sorry to say I cannot pursue this enquiry, for their surveys are less complete and do not give the necessary information about manorial tenures.

I now come to the more important section of my paper, in which, as I have already stated, I shall attempt to show what light these surveys throw on the question of enclosing.

It is unfortunate that none of the villages for which I have surveys are dealt with in the documents relating to the Commission of 1517 on enclosures, which Mr. Leadam has already edited for this Society, or in the additional documents that he has published in his 'Domesday of Enclosures.' It would

have been interesting to identify the enclosures complained of in 1517, and to have seen what progress had been made since. It will be found, however, that even without this additional source of information the surveys themselves present us with quite enough facts to enable one to make pretty definite statements as to the extent to which the enclosing movement had been effective in these localities, and the methods by which the enclosing had been brought about.

It will hardly, I suppose, be necessary to remind anyone that enclosing is a rather vague term which may cover several distinct processes. On the one hand it may denote the gradual approvement and bringing into use of the waste lands of a village, while on the other hand it may equally well stand for the gradual conversion of the ancient open fields with their scattered strips into several closes surrounded by fences. In either case, too, there are two uses, namely tillage and pasture, to which the lands enclosed may be put.

Altogether, then, it may be said that enclosing means four distinct things, each of which might be examined separately, namely :—

(1) Enclosure from the waste for tillage.
(2) „ „ „ for pasture.
(3) Enclosure from the open fields for tillage.
(4) „ „ „ for pasture.

As it happens, however, it will not be necessary for us to examine all these ; for I may as well at once state that so far as I can see none of the villages surveyed had been the scene of enclosures for pasture, whether from the waste or the open fields. There had been plenty of enclosing in some of the villages, but all the enclosures, if we are to believe the surveys, were used for tillage. The enquiry, therefore, may be confined to two heads only, and I will begin with approvements or enclosures from the waste, as being the simpler process of the two.

Under this head the questions that have to be answered are two, namely: How much land, if any, in these villages still lay waste? and secondly, What proportion of the land

already in cultivation shows signs of having been brought into cultivation by approvement from the waste and of never having formed part of the old open fields? The answers to these questions, as might be expected, differ considerably in the different villages. In Toft Monks, Coltishall, and Coton the amount of waste still left unapproved is exceedingly small. In Coltishall, for example, it seems to be about twenty acres out of 1,200. In Toft Monks only the village greens, containing a few acres and a fair sized meadow, are returned as communal property, and though three heaths, certain groves, and a large wood are also mentioned, they were all in private ownership. If we turn to Hempstead, Lessingham, and Ruislip, on the other hand, it appears that very little approvement had been done. In Ruislip, which is a large village of 3,000 acres, quite half the township lands were still occupied by woods and common, and the wood was not divided, as at Toft, into severalties. Similarly in Hempstead the proportion of waste to cultivated ground was, roughly speaking, 400 to 500 acres; in Lessingham 200 to 450; and in Staninghall 80 to 300. At Horstead, the remaining village for which there is a complete survey, the relative proportion of waste was less, being only 350 acres to 2,750.

Such being the respective areas of waste still existing in the different villages when the surveys were made, we next come to the question, 'Does much land show signs of having formerly been waste and subsequently approved?' Naturally there is no direct evidence on this point, but still inferences on this head can be made, partly from the absence of strips in certain furlongs, partly from the size of the parcels mentioned, and partly from the local names, and these inferences all go to show that in the villages, where there was little existing waste, a good deal had once been so, but had been approved at some time or other. For instance, at Horstead the furlongs with true strips in them all lie near the centre of the village, then come a ring of commons, and then outside the commons another ring of furlongs, which are without strips, but which contain parcels of 12, 20, 60, and even 100

acres. Here I think the inference seems obvious that this outer ring was never a component part of the old fields, but is the result of approvements. Similarly at Lessingham and Tofts Monks beside the furlongs with strips we find a number of closes, many with separate names, which have all the appearance of being approvements from the waste.

In addition to the approvements from the waste which take the form of closes, some approvements, especially those made at an early date, may be recognised in furlongs divided into strips. This kind of approvement, though it looks like old open field, betrays itself by the names given to the furlongs. For instance, at Coton, though there was no waste when the survey was made worth speaking of, at the far end of the village away from the town the survey records several furlongs with such names as the Brakes, the Middle Hay Furlong, the Long Hay Furlong, and the Short Hay Furlong. Similarly at Crostwick we have Over Frith Hegge Furlong and Nether Frith Hegge Furlong; and at Toft Monks, next the big wood, Over and Nether Starre Hegge Furlongs, Devil's Oak Furlong, and also Sallow Hegge and Short Thornes. These names, to my mind, all point to enclosures that had formerly been made from either heath or wood, for otherwise the furlongs would not be called Hays or Brakes; and, as confirmatory evidence that this is implied by the name Brakes, I may mention that in a map I have seen of West Wretham, in Norfolk, six large Brakes are set out in midst of land that is otherwise all barren heath. There are also Brake Deeles at Horstead in the outer ring of furlongs I have alluded to. An equally suspicious name is Whindale Street in Toft Monks, for this points to the ancient Whin Deeles. At Lessingham, where the waste had not been enclosed, the Whin Deeles still lay in the middle of the South Common in 1584.

In answer, then, to the question, had there been much enclosing from the waste in these villages, we may safely state that in most of the Norfolk ones there had been, and on a considerable scale. But on the other hand it must be

admitted that very few of the approvements seem to be at all modern. For Hays and Brakes, which are in strips, can safely be set down as old; while the large furlongs at Horstead without strips would also seem to be so, as they are nearly all mentioned in the rentals as existing in Edward IV.'s reign. Approvement from the waste, therefore, does not seem to be a characteristic of Tudor times even in those villages where the surveys indicate that at a former time it had been largely practised, while in the rest the evidence tends to show that it had hardly begun.

This being the conclusion reached, it is interesting to note at Horstead and Staninghall at the very end of the century a return to the method of approvement. As I have already stated, in 1586 there were still 350 acres of waste in Horstead and 80 acres in Staninghall, but in 1599 all this was finally enclosed by agreement between the lords of the manor and the tenants.

The documents connected with this transaction are in the King's College muniment room. They begin with the following letter addressed by the tenants to the Provost:—

September 8, 1598.

Sir,—Wheras upon the Motion for devydinge the comons of your Manor of Horsted between the College and us, the Tennants of the same, It pleased your worship together with Mr. D. Montlowe,[1] Mr. Vice Provost and others at your Lodginge in Cambridge, some of us being then there, thus to resolve, That at Bartholemewtyde or Sturbridge ffaire (or what tyme else thereaboute myght best fitte us) should be sent up fower or fyve Tennants with the hande and allowance of the rest, (that you might be assured of the general consent) to conferre and if it may bee to agree upon the matter.

These are therefore to give your worship to understand That whatsoever Mr. Topcliffe, Mr. Breeze, John Picklin, Thomas Picklin, Robert Baell, whom wee have purposely chosen and doo send upp to treate that business, shall with the College conclude, wee whose names are subscribed, will willingly assent, yelde unto, and performe.

And fforasmuch, Sir, as wee have hitherto found yourself and the College in all things very gracious and favourable, which wee most

[1] The College Farmer, by lease dated Mich. 1597, for a term of 17½ years.

thankfully doe acknowledge, wee praye and entreate, that that good Respect may bee still continued unto us, That wee as pore Tennants may allwayes have as just occassions of Love unto you as of dutye. And thus, not further troubling your worship wee comend you to Allmighty God.

Horsted the VIIIth of September 1598.

Your Tennants lovinge
and at command.

In accordance with this letter the deputation appear to have come to Cambridge, and Mr. Topcliffe made various offers on behalf of the tenants. At first the tenants wanted to get the whole of the commons for themselves, paying in lieu to the College an annual rent of £12, with £5 more for the rights of the lords as regards the shack. The College, however, were wiser than to accept this, and eventually agreed to allow the wastes to be enclosed on the following conditions:—

1. The lords to take eighty acres in severalty.
2. The lords to reserve all rights to treasure trove, minerals, waifs, strays, and goods of felons, with right of entry to take the same.
3. All rights of pasture, shack, and foldage to be extinguished on all lands in the village.
4. The tenants to pay an annual quit rent of £7. 14*s*. 5*d*. for their shares of the common.

This agreement was carried out by a number of conveyances. The most important is an indenture (King's Muniments, N. 11) dated March 26, 1599, by which the College on the one part, and the tenants on the other part, mutually convey and exchange their rights. The tenants then by subsequent indentures of a less lengthy nature, a specimen of which I have in my possession, proceeded to subdivide their share among themselves. The lords were well advised to take a share of the heaths, for their eighty acres now produce about £100 a year instead of the £5 they would be collecting if they had accepted the original proposal of the tenants.

We may now turn to consider the second form of enclos-

ing, namely, the consolidation and fencing of the strips in the open fields. In dealing with this I shall confine myself entirely to Norfolk, as I have not worked out the surveys of Coton or Ruislip. I may say, however, in passing that so far as I have glanced through these two surveys I have not noticed much mention of enclosures in them, certainly not in the case of Ruislip.

In Norfolk the case is different, and certainly in Toft Monks, Horstead, Staninghall, and Coltishall the enclosing of the old open fields had made considerable progress. On first reading through the surveys this does not appear to be the case. Furlong after furlong is recorded in strips. Every now and then, however, one comes to the word 'inclusatum,' and when a map has been at length compiled, it is found that this word 'inclusatum' occurs just at the place where there is a fence in modern times. It does not necessarily mean, therefore, that the particular strip in connection with which it is inserted was fenced all round, but that on one side of it ran a fence which divided up the old open field. Indeed if one imagines the process of enclosing to be merely the fencing of a few strips here and there, as each man's fancy dictated, or as he happened to have a few consecutive strips, one gets an entirely wrong impression of what was going on, and one which ought to be discarded. On the contrary the enclosing we are now discussing was a very gradual and elaborate process, often carried out by several owners in conjunction, and consisting of four distinct steps, all of which might either go on at once or be taken singly.

In the first place before enclosing at all a man would have to consolidate his holding. This he would do by exchange, and it might take years before he got enough together to make it worth his while to put up a fence at his sole expense. At Horstead, however, it is clear that a great deal had been done in this way. In some furlongs there are still intermixed strips, but in a majority of furlongs either one owner owns all the strips, or all but a very few. In fact it is not too much to say that the outlines of all the modern estates in the

village were already clearly marked in 1586 though the land still lay in strips. In 1564 this was far less the case, and the Court rolls show that a great number of exchanges or sales had taken place in the interval.

The second step which a man would take when he had got a sufficient number of strips together would be to plough up the 'metae' between them. At Horstead, and more frequently at Staninghall, the survey mentions this as having been done, but only here and there, and on the whole it is clear that the owners had not taken this step in 1586.

The third step consisted not only in ploughing up the 'metae,' but in altering the direction of the ploughing, so that land which had from time immemorial been ploughed, say from north to south, came to be ploughed in some other direction. This is also occasionally referred to in the surveys as having taken place, but it is very rare.

The fourth step was the erection of fences. As already remarked, a number of fences are referred to in the surveys, but it is clear that in many cases the fences had been put up without waiting for any of the other steps to be taken. That is to say, the fences often surround furlongs still in intermixed strips, and one can only suppose that in these cases the fences had been erected by several proprietors jointly. Several of the fences seem to have been erected more to break the wind than for any other purpose, for they do not always form complete enclosures.

Nothing but a large scale map can really show the extent to which this kind of enclosing had progressed in any village; but, if Horstead may be taken as typical, it will be approximately true to say that most of the enclosures which had been made had been made near the chief village street, or round the chief messuages. That is to say, they were not scattered about in isolated patches in the open fields to any extent, and they very rarely fenced in areas of less than five acres. The enclosures, in fact, were not of one or two strips only, but made fields very much as at present. Further, in most of these enclosures, even in those owned in

severalty, the old strips still lay untouched and the 'metae' unploughed up. This may seem curious, but the reason is not far to seek. So long as the ownership was intermixed the strips would naturally remain; but even when all the strips belonged to one owner, there remained many objections to removing the 'metae.' For some strips were freehold, and some copyhold, and so the lord of the manor was interested in preserving the boundaries. Some strips, too, might be held of one manor, and some of another, and this would also operate in the same direction; for it was not till manorial rights had ceased to be of value that lords of manors could acquiesce—in merely knowing the acreage of their copyholds and remaining ignorant of their whereabouts and abuttals.

Horstead, therefore, though in one sense it was finally enclosed in 1599, still remained largely in strips for a long time after, and the glebe is even in strips at the present time.

So far as I can see, Coltishall, Staninghall, and Toft Monks were in much the same condition as Horstead in 1586, but I have not worked out the details so carefully. Perhaps the strips were not so well consolidated. Hempstead and Lessingham, on the contrary, it is quite clear were more backward; there the strips were still almost entirely intermixed, and, as we have already seen, the waste was unenclosed. Yet even here a number of fences are mentioned, and these on examination turn out to occupy the places of the modern hedges.

We may say then that one or other of the steps necessary for carrying through the enclosure of the open fields was gradually going forward in all these Norfolk villages, and that the evidence of the surveys does not materially differ from the general statements about East Norfolk which are to be found in economic histories. It only makes clearer the exact method by which the enclosing was being carried out.

Note.—Since the above was in type I have come across the term 'slade' in Moor's *Suffolk Words*. He says it means a hollow, and quotes Drayton's *Polyolbion*—

'And satyrs that in slades and gloomy dimbles dwell.'

ON SOME POLITICAL THEORIES OF THE EARLY JESUITS

By J. NEVILLE FIGGIS, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read May 20, 1897

FROM Hildebrand to John Stuart Mill is a far cry. Yet there is a common element in the thought of the two. Both held the same purely secular theory of the civil State. Both were jealous of State interference and would have narrowed the scope of governmental action. Both held that there are limits, especially in religious matters, which the State may not overstep, and both, though in different ways, would admit the right of an oppressed people to rebel against its sovereign. Their horizons were different, and their objects looked at in one point of view are even opposed. For Mill believed in the Divine right of the individual, or something like it, while, if Hildebrand would have bound kings with chains, it was only that he might forge more enduring fetters of iron for their peoples. Yet I believe that there are links of connection between the two; and of these the earlier Jesuits were not the least important. From the days of Hildebrand down to our own time there appear to me to have been two mutually opposed theories of the State, taking different shapes according to the needs of different ages, and defended by controversial methods and arguments which changed with the facts to which they owed their force. Indeed, so Protean were their manifestations that they commonly meet with nothing but contempt from us who owe much to both theories, and have entered into the heritage prepared for us by conflicts of which we have forgotten the meaning. We are apt

to despise arguments which appear absurd and sophistical merely because they were effective in a past age. To our view the protagonists of the great struggle are united at last in the scorn of educated men. Yet to fix attention on the obsolete and superficial aspects of past controversies is hardly a hopeful way of reaching to the understanding of them. At least some effort is needed to enable us to pass to the real essence of that struggle which has divided men in so many centuries. These two views are: (1) the omnipotence and transcendent worth of government; (2) the need of remembering that the State was made for man, not man for the State, and of setting due limits to the action of the latter. In writers like William of Ockham and Dante the former doctrine appeared as the counter-check of the Imperialist party to the temporal claims of the Papacy. It re-appeared in the form of the Divine Right of Kings, and is, it seems to me, at the bottom of Rousseau's theory of the functions of government, whence it has passed to modern socialists. But it is of the second of the two doctrines above mentioned, the theory of the limits of State action, that this paper attempts to treat a phase.

For assuredly Hildebrand's notion did not die with him. Developed and expanded they crystallised into a system. In St. Thomas Aquinas and other writers we find what Mr. Poole has termed 'the hierarchical theory of the State.'[1] It was a doctrine subject to modification in both form and substance—witness the gulf between the theories of the indirect and the direct power of the Pope. Nor was it ever accepted by uncompromising supporters of emperors or kings or even republics. But it had this of significance about it. It combined an attack on national independence with an assertion of political liberty. In order to support the Pope it undermined the powers of all secular sovereigns, and explained, with a passion of emphasis, that the State, as such, has no right to interfere with religion. Would not the same prohibition have approved itself to the modern individualist, save that for

[1] *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, chap. viii.

him the scholastic *secundum quid* would have become an uncompromising *simpliciter*? Moreover, theories of popular or at least aristocratic government found useful against kings were found no less apt for another purpose. During the early years of the fifteenth century, in the effort to bring to a close the scandals of the great schism, men came to realise that, in order to get rid of the rival popes, it might become needful to depose them. But by what right? Clearly because the Church was not a monarchy, so far as its earthly *régime* was concerned, but an aristocracy or more probably a 'mixed government,' in which final decisions rested with a general council. Thus we find that the great theologians of Constance, Gerson[1] and Zabarella,[2] make use of language which is curiously parallel to that afterwards used against kings. They insist that the Church is not an absolute monarchy, that general councils are superior to the Pope and may depose him, that a mixed government is the best; for was it not found among the Jews, and must not Christ have given to His Church the ideal polity, which is avowedly that which combines the advantages of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, and escapes the evils of any of them? It was the irony of fate that this doctrine, useless save for one brief moment against the Popes, should have given to Rome her most formidable intellectual weapon in the struggle for temporal supremacy. This same theory of power originating in the people, of the advantages of a mixed government or something like it, was to be employed in later times with even greater passion in favour of the deposing power. Before leaving the subject of Constance it is worth noting that the council in the controversy about Jean Petit was driven to a condemnation of tyrannicide, which was in later years to afford great opportunities to Jesuit ingenuity in explaining it away.[3]

[1] I.e. *De Auferibilitate Papæ*, *De Statibus Ecclesiasticis*, and *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*.

[2] *De Schismatibus Authoritate Imperatoris tollendis*.

[3] See, for an account of this controversy, Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, i. 372–4.

However, the Papacy won the day and established its autocracy. From the dissolution of the Council of Basle there was no more room in the Church for any but monarchical theories of its government. But the liberalism of Constance had still its use. Vain as an anti-Papal doctrine, it was to become the strongest joint in the Papalist armour. A new terror attacked the Holy See. Saved from the frying-pan of episcopacy it seemed like to perish in the fire of temporal monarchy. Nationalism—for as yet toleration was undreamed of—was the new danger which the Reformation brought to Rome. Nor was the danger from England alone. It triumphed in the formula of Westphalia, *cujus regio ejus religio.* Even during the latter years of the seventeenth century Gallicanism found a mighty champion in Louis XIV. and became a source of many troubles, the parent of portentous folios, if not quite the mother of a new schism. Now against the rising forces of the Reformation, formidable mainly when wielded by kings, what better weapon could be found than the old theories of the deposing power, of popular rights, of the political supremacy of Rome? In its earlier days the Reformation must inevitably have enlisted against it conservative forces in every nation. If these were to be effectually used, the most hopeful means of doing so was to give them free play by declaring it to be a fundamental law of all Christian countries that the sovereign must be Catholic. There can have been no country—even Scotland—where the ecclesiastical revolution failed to arouse a deep resentment in the class of mind, numerous everywhere, which holds by what is traditional for its own sake, which loves the old just because it is not modern, which looks upon abuses as evidence of vitality, which in regarding deep-seated corruptions sees only that they are time-honoured, and recognises ancient anomalies merely because they are picturesque. This sentiment, unless considerations of duty or interest restrain it, is always at the service of the adversaries of revolutionary change, whether it be good or evil. The point was to enlist its full strength on the side of the Papacy. The notion that

it is a fundamental law of every Christian State to be ruled by a Catholic might do this. If the conservatives could be led to realise that it was not merely their right but their duty to rid themselves of heretic sovereigns, the chances of rolling back the tide of revolution would be greatly bettered. Thus it was natural to find that one of the main principles of the Counter-Reformation is this—that all kings must be Catholics, and that subjects on Papal suggestion may depose a heretic sovereign. The principle was in great measure successful. It is quite defensible from the point of view of those who held it. The tide was rolled back. France did not have a Huguenot king. Southern Europe was entirely won for the Papacy. Kings themselves admitted the claim. It is emphatically endorsed in the will of Philip IV. of Spain,[1] just as our Act of Settlement enshrines the theory that an English king must be in communion with the Church of England.

Now the body who popularised these views was the Society of Jesus. It did not invent them. Even in their own day the exigencies of their position had driven the Huguenots to advocate very similar doctrines, and the 'Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos' remains one of the ablest expositions of the theory of the original contract.[2] Knox,[3] Goodman,[4] Buchanan[5] and Cartwright[6] held a theory of the subjection of the civil to the ecclesiastical power hardly distinguishable from the Jesuit doctrine. Nor must we forget that the most vehement of the Ligueurs, Boucher[7] and

[1] The will is printed in Legrelle, *La Diplomatie Française et la Succession de l'Espagne*, i. 458.

[2] I do not understand why Ranke, in his brief essay, *Der Idee der Volkssouveränetät in den Schriften der Jesuiten* (*Werke*, xxiv. 225), denies the formation of any general theories of popular rights before the Jesuits. Buchanan, whom he regards as merely concerned with the affairs of Scotland, spends more than half his work in laying down universal principles. The *Vindiciæ* is at least as wide in its scope as most Jesuit writings.

[3] Knox, *Works*, *passim*.

[4] *How to Obey or Disobey*.

[5] *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*.

[6] *Declaration of Discipline: Second Admonition to Parl.*, &c.

[7] *Sermons de la Simulée Conversion*.

Louis d'Orleans [1] were not Jesuits, and that they treat of the origin and nature of the civil State and of popular rights in tones but little different. Still the Jesuits pressed their views for a longer time and deserve more attention than most of their predecessors or contemporaries. Certainly they received it. They became the common mark of attack to all supporters of kings. The first thought of all believers in the Divine right of kings is that to teach the right of resistance in any form is to class oneself with the Jesuits. The deposing power is so vividly pictured as of the essence of the Society that Presbyterians (who held a very similar theory) and other Dissenters are regarded with evident *bona fides* as teaching all that is vital to Jesuitry. Further, the Society was popularly regarded as the inspirer of the different attempts to assassinate Henri IV., during whose reign the order was expelled from France. Books by Becanus, Suarez, Sanctarelli, Mariana, Bellarmin, Jouvency, were at different times condemned by the Parlement of Paris, the great enemy of the Jesuits and asserter of Gallicanism.[2] From the Society of Jesus the theory passed to the English Whigs. Locke and Sidney, if they did not take their political faith bodily from Suarez or Bellarmin, managed in a remarkable degree to conceal the differences between the two. With the Revolution Whigs the connection of Jesuit doctrines is direct and obvious. Their theory of natural rights, of an original compact, and of a utilitarian basis to the State, differs but little from the Jesuit doctrines. Thence the transition is easy to Bentham and the greatest happiness of the greatest number. From him to his disciple Mill is but a step. So it may be that between the mediæval Papacy and modern publicists there exists a closer tie than is apparent.

The historical connection of the different schools is to my apprehension beyond question. In each age we find a

[1] *Premier et second avertissements. Apologie ou Défense des Catholiques unis les uns avec les autres.*

[2] Most of the decrees of the Parlement of Paris on the subject are to be found in a *Recueil de Pièces touchant l'Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Liège, 1713.

school of thought regarding the State in a similar light, and the conceptions entertained of politics do not materially differ. The State is thought of as based on utility limited in scope, not even legally omnipotent. Set over against this school is its perennial adversary, which, whether it defends the rights of emperor, king, or people, has yet the same purpose. It seeks to secure at all costs the independence of the State, and insists on the legal omnipotence and omnicompetence of the sovereign, and would crush all opposing principles. 'The State is a convenience' is the cry of the one school—from Hildebrand to Herbert Spencer. 'Hardly even a convenience, a necessary evil,' some would say, but that view is rather an individual taste. On the other hand, from the impressive pages of Dante down to Rousseau and modern socialism, we hear proclaimed what may be termed the religion of the State, almighty, coming down from Heaven, 'that mortal god,' the Leviathan into whose nose Pope, nor presbyter, nor populace, shall avail to put a hook. The views of Rousseau and perhaps those of other modern writers form, I think, an interesting combination. From the one side he took the notion of the omnipotence of the sovereign—for we must not forget that Rousseau believed in inculcating a single State religion, Theism, and in getting rid of atheists. From the other school he took the belief in the sovereignty of the people. The mingling of the two conceptions is responsible for much that is characteristic of the way in which our own generation regards politics and the State.

It is, then, my object to examine, so far as may be, one phase in this development, to trace briefly certain of the political views of the early Jesuits, to indicate something of their origin, and to assign their place in the history of political theories by an attempt to estimate their relation to the thought of other ages.

The circumstances which favoured the rise of the Society of Jesus made it the leader and motive force of the Counter-Reformation. It must be remembered that in that age toleration was not seriously dreamed of as a practicable

notion. Uniformity within his own territory was the ideal of every ruler—still more of all his subjects, who differed deeply enough as to the beliefs which they would persecute, but not at all as to their belief in persecution. It was commonly believed to be not merely possible but easy to stamp out unlawful opinions by the sword. Indeed, the impossibility has never been proved, and it is not clear but that history favours this view. Hence no one but felt the danger to the truth that must arise from a heretic sovereign. In such an age the question as to the right attitude of the spiritual to the temporal authority was not simple. Nor is it clear that the worst arguments—and both sides liked them pretty bad—were all on one side. Was the King to be left free to turn heretic, like Henry VIII., and to drive his subjects and posterity for many generations into everlasting perdition?[1] Or, as the Presbyterians say, 'Shall an idolatrous monarch have power to deliver his subjects to the witchcrafts of Babylon?' What hope is there for truth, if kings are free to turn heretics and suppress the right faith? And if, as seems clear, the evil must be guarded against, there is only one way of doing so. The spiritual authority, whether Pope or King, must claim the right to interfere in politics for the salvation of souls. It must be able to direct the acts of the secular sovereign towards eternal life; and, if necessary, to advise the people of the occasions when it has become their duty to fight for the freedom of their faith and to depose their sovereign in the name of the rights of conscience. The dangers incident to such a theory are obvious. Rebellion is encouraged. Governments are placed in a position of unstable equilibrium. Clericalism becomes dominant. Politics are strangled by the priest, and this even more with the Presbyterian theory than the Jesuit. The deposing power means a spiritual tyranny and must be overthrown, if the

[1] Gretser gives a vivid description of the evils of leaving the civil magistrate supreme in religious matters. He pertinently asks whether passive obedience is to be exhibited to a monarch who turns the churches into mosques and tries to replace the cross by the crescent.—*Commentarius Exegeticus*, c. vi.

State is to work out its own salvation. Very true. And such was the line of argument of Anglican divinity, and of all upholders of the Divine Right of Kings, whether here or in France. Yet the dilemma is real. In an age of religious change, where the enforcement of uniformity of belief is regarded as the duty of all States, either truth must be constantly endangered, if the State be fully sovereign, or else the stability and independence of the State are liable to be sapped by clericalism, and the temporal power is placed under the galling yoke of the spiritual. From this dilemma there is no escape that I can see, until toleration be recognised as a practical limit on State action. The conflict was inevitable. Both sides had hold of a truth. We may all of us have our sympathies. But we have little right to blame either side. Certainly he would be a bold man who should assert that national independence is a greater good than the knowledge of the truth. The Jesuits and Presbyterians chose the one, the *politiques* the other. Were the former quite wrong?

But this is not all. The theory of the deposing power had led in the realm of fact to notable results. The League was its visible expression, and the assassination of Henri III. its logical outcome. What was to be said? Is tyrannicide a duty? And if so, what is a tyrant? Is the betrayer of his baptismal faith anything better? And how does he come by his crown? From God alone—and on no condition? Then is God the cause of heresy, and how shall kings be said to reign by Him? Is it from the Pope? What, then, of the infidel sovereign? Or did not Christianity make a change? Does not every Christian State make a tacit compact to be orthodox? Then heretics may be deposed. But surely political power is immediately from God? Yes, but that is in the people, and had not they the aim, when they transferred power to the prince, of securing the common good, which can never be under a heretic? Or did he not make a tacit agreement to preserve them in their faith? Anyhow is it not the right of every man to receive from the State security of life, property, and religion? Is not he who denies these rights a tyrant? It

must be. And then as to killing him? We may not kill kings. They sit in God's seat, and by Him decree judgment. They are powers ordained of God. Not for wrath alone, but for conscience sake must we obey. Even to froward masters service is due. And the primitive Christians were willing martyrs. Who dares touch the Lord's anointed? David abstained, and the Council of Constance condemned it. But is a tyrant a king? Is a heretic a king? Or an excommunicate? Perhaps David lacked not the right to slay Saul, but only the will. Are we certain that St. Peter and the early Christians submitted to the Emperor for any other reason than that they could not help themselves? Were the Christians loyal to Julian the Apostate, or did St. Gregory Nazianzen desire to kick him? And what of Uzziah? or Jeroboam? If a king be anointed he must be under the Church. And as to the Council of Constance, what Pope ever ratified the decree?[1] And what does it mean? Does it do more than assert that it is forbidden for any individual on his own authority to murder anyone whom he is pleased to regard as a tyrant? But what if the tyrant be condemned and deposed by the public authority of the whole commonwealth? May not its judgments be exercised by its ministers? And a deposed monarch assuredly is no longer a king, but a public enemy like a usurper. And who doubts that anyone may slay a usurper, or else we should be driven to blame Jehoiada, and Ehud would have lived in vain?

These and such like were the questions which the Jesuits were driven by the exigencies of the situation and the prevailing modes of controversy to consider. It was needful to face them. In the fevered strife of religion and politics none would have a chance of making his will effectual as a force who had not deliberated on the problem of the mutual relations of Church and State, and resolved with boldness on the answer which he would give. Certainly it is not lack of boldness or hesitating maxims that the reader of Mariana or Keller or

[1] The following is the proposition condemned, 'Tyrannum posse et debere occidi quocunque subdito non aperta vi modo sed etiam per insidias et fraude.'

Eudaemon-Joannes is likely to make a charge against the Jesuits.

It appears, then, that the general situation and the special conditions in France and England made it needful for the supporters of the Papacy to develop some theory which should justify the political supremacy of the Pope. They were then compelled to attack the questions of the deposing power and tyrannicide, and to consider the problem of the origin of government and of the nature of supreme power in the State. Their doctrines are expounded, and for more immediate uses, in books which may be styled occasional, such as the 'Controversia Anglicana' of Becanus, the 'Commentarius Exegeticus'[1] of Gretser, the 'Apologia pro Henrico Garneto' of Eudaemon-Joannes, Doleman's 'Next Succession to the Crown of England,'[2] an attempt to set aside James in favour of a Catholic, and Adam Tanner's 'Defensio Ecclesiasticæ Libertatis,' written in support of the Pope in his quarrel with the Venetian republic. These are of the nature of pamphlets. Even the 'De Romano Pontifice' of Bellarmin, and the 'Defensio Fidei Catholicæ' of Suarez would fall under this head. But the Society did not stop here. Its bent was in favour of a complete discussion of the principles on which it acted. Loyalty to St. Thomas prescribed the form which the discussion should take. In addition, then, to works called out by the chances of controversy there is a large and bulky literature of a scientific character. Among them are the 'De Legibus' of Suarez, one of the ablest of all the Jesuits; the 'De Justitia et Jure' of the clear and analytic Molina; other treatises with the same title by Jean de Lugo, Lessius, and Azorius, the 'Commentarii Theologici' of Gregory de

[1] A book directed against the oath of allegiance to James I., which was expressly framed so as to be admissible for Catholics.

[2] This book was written by Father Parsons, or Persons. It was so regarded even at the time. I do not know what grounds Father Gerard has for denying the authorship. The question is discussed in Tierney (Dodd, iii. 31 sqq.) and indeed he appears to settle it in favour of Parsons's authorship. See also Law, *The Quarrel between Jesuits and Seculars*, pp. 27, 64, and *The Archpriest Controversy*, passim.

Valentia, 'Commentaries on St. Thomas,' by Jean de Salas (a most interesting writer), Vasquez, Medina; treatises on 'Moral Theology,' by Busenbaum, Toletus, Castro-Palao. Some of these books have a much wider scope than the resolving of the politico-ecclesiastical problem, and it is as one element in the general system that the problem appears. But it is generally discussed with exhaustive completeness even where it forms but a part of the writer's subject. Many of them take the form of Commentaries on the 'Summa' of St. Thomas, or rather of collections of disputations on that part of it (I. 2, qq. xc. sqq.), which treats of laws. Indeed, after perusing them one finds St. Thomas refreshingly brief. Thus the parentage of many of the ideas is not far to seek. The treatises are scholastic in form and method, very learned and very long. But they are clear and accurate in expression beyond anything which a modern reader would expect or desire. Opposing views are expounded without bias, and as a rule without heat. Controversy, if less of an art than in our day, is distinctly more of a science. There is a further advantage about the well-nigh universal dependence on St. Thomas. It is easy to summarise the views of the writers and to frame a conception of the general character of their system. Details may differ. Many modifications and much expansion of St. Thomas are to be found. Yet, after a study of a fair number of the works, it will go hard with a reader if he have not a clear idea of the general tone and temper with which the early Jesuits regarded politics. For they knew what they were driving at, and they drove straight. Never losing sight of their goal, without passion, but with great critical skill they employ all the intellectual weapons at their disposal. They pile subtlety on subtlety, they meet quibble with counter-quibble. Through the maze of minute distinctions, never fearing to face a foe, never leaving a fortress in the rear, they press towards a certain end. From the chaos of learned comment and conflicting arguments, from Scripture texts and classical examples, from ancient philosophers and mediæval canonists they evolve a system of thought, which for clearness

of outline and logical cohesion is not to be despised—even by an age which rejoices in the synthetic philosophy. At least, then, one may attempt to give a slight sketch of their thought in its main characteristics, without wearying you with an undue mass of quotations. The account is perforce but general, and lays stress on the features common to most of these writers. It is not intended to accuse them of mere plagiarism or to attribute to them a cast-iron uniformity. Still, fundamentally they agree.

First, then, and most perfect of all governments is the Church. It is a monarchy without limitations. It comes not from below as the royal power, but from Christ, whose vicar is the Pope. This is what Christ meant when He refused to let the people make Him king. He feared to draw His power, as do earthly kings, from the people.[1] So, too, He said that His kingdom was not of this world, thereby pointing to the plenitude of power given to the Pope immediately from God.[2] Election is merely the condition without which God will not transfer the power; it does not make the Pope in any way the delegate of the Cardinals.[3] Christ is, indeed, the head of the universal commonwealth of Christians. But He has delegated all His power on earth to His minister. It is because Christ is the real King of all States, that temporal monarchs are to regard the interference of the Pope as but the action of another subordinate, whose position is yet superior to their own.[4] The holy State of the Church is the pattern and ideal of all governments. Nor is it a State merely by metaphor. Rather other States only exist for reasons of utility. But this State has its origin, not in the convenience of man, but in the act of God, and the commission to St. Peter. Besides, while absolute sovereignty would be dangerous in a king, there is no risk in the case of the Pope

[1] Santarelli, *Tractatus de Hæresi*, I. 31, 2. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] Jean de Salas, *Disputationes in Primam Secundæ S. Thomæ*, viii. 3. Dante expounds precisely the same view of the functions of the electors in the Holy Roman Empire, *De Monarchia*, iii.

[4] Eudaemon-Joannes, *Apologia*, 81.

who is infallible.[1] His power, then, is truly sovereign and unlimited. He is *solutus legibus*, and may not alienate the *plenitudo potestatis*, against which no time may prescribe. Even here we come across the notion that the Pope might turn heretic and require the judgment of a council.[2] But on the whole his power is regarded as universal over all Christians, unlimited, inalienable, imprescriptible. In the highest and truest sense it comes immediately from God. In this it is unique, for Christ never commanded the secular power in the same way. Still, even the Pope may not abrogate natural law, but of course the possibility is absurd to contemplate, and his dispensing power would be quite sufficient for all practical purposes.

So far of the spiritual State. Far other is the secular. In every way it is inferior. Its end is merely peace, and the earthly good of man. That of the ecclesiastical is eternal life. True, the civil State comes from God, otherwise it would be unlawful; but it is from God only as the author of nature, Who made man a political animal. It is concerned merely with the external actions of man. Based on human nature, it exists for earthly utility. The ecclesiastical State is founded on the fiat of God, and exists for a heavenly end. Hence it is to the secular State as the soul is to the body, as the sun to the moon. Salmeron, probably Molina,[3] and others regard all government as a consequence of the fall. But this view is not universal. Osorius denies it,[4] and more philosophically deduces it from the nature of men, as such. Still, in the deeper importance of its end the Church may direct the State, and abrogate its laws and change its government. But in the view of the great majority this power is only indirect. The Pope only deals with temporal affairs so far as they have relation to the spiritual welfare of men. So far, however, his supremacy is clear. What else can be the meaning

[1] Osorius, *Conciones*, t. iii. 42.

[2] Santarelli, *De Hæresi*, I. 31, 5.

[3] *De Justitia et Jure*, Tr. V. Disp. 46, and Tr. II. Disp. 22.

[4] *Conciones*, iii. 39; cf. also Jean de Salas, *In Thomam Aquinatis Quæstiones*, vii. § 1.

of the commission to Jeremiah, 'I have set thee above nations and kings, to build up and break down'; or of the two swords in the hands of St. Peter which Christ said were enough and not too much? Besides, Abel was the first priest, and Cain the first king, though many fancy Nimrod. There are many instances in the Old Testament of the superiority of priests to kings. God himself founded the Church, whereas He was displeased with the Jews' demand for a king. Again, whatever be the case before Christianity or with regard to infidel sovereigns, things are different now in Christendom. For in accepting the faith all Christian peoples accepted the supremacy of the Church, and by a tacit compact agreed to endure none but orthodox rulers. Here is the theory of an original contract deduced from a supposed concordat. In some cases even the baptismal vow seems to be regarded as of the nature of a contract whereby the Church is given power to depose heretic kings. But whether on the general ground of the supremacy of the Church or on the theory of a tacit contract, the conclusion is equally clear that the Pope, acting as God's vicar, may depose kings and release subjects from their allegiance, if that be necessary for their salvation.

This doctrine is bound up with the Jesuit theory of monarchy. Kingly power is neither unlimited nor immediately from God. Kings are not the masters of their subjects, but the governors of free citizens, having the use, not the dominion of their lives and properties. *Rex est minister Dei, et reipublicæ pro-rex*, for it is thence that their power derives its origin, and every king is such by an original popular appointment. It is true that God as the author of nature drives men to union. From this fact, without any conscious agreement, arises political power. It comes from the nature of man. Once men agree to come together and live, political power arises without any further human volition. This creed is the more common. Lessius seems a little nearer to the ordinary Whig theory. He declares that the republic can have no dominion over the lives and property of

its subjects, for that they have not themselves, and cannot therefore resign to the community.[1] But the usual view seems rather that political power as such is not limited by individual rights, but comes immediately from God, in the sense that men cannot help themselves in forming the union from which government and subjection result. But this power is in the people, for nature made all men free and equal, and there is no reason why one should have jurisdiction rather than another. The patriarchal theory is dismissed, for Adam had economic, not political power.[2] The whole community, then, is the immediate depositary of political power. But it cannot exercise it directly. It must delegate its power to a king or ruling body, under such conditions as shall please it. The condition need not be express, and how far a people might choose to transfer all its power to a king is hard to say. Certainly it could go a long way, though to do this would be very foolish. Medina thinks that, since a republic is instituted solely for the common good, this is to be regarded as a sort of fundamental law; and this is in accordance with the general tone on the subject. Besides, there is a distinction. In a Christian State there must ever be preserved the tacit reservation by which the orthodoxy of the sovereign is made a condition. In some writers we find mention of a definite original contract between king and people.[3] Anyhow, the original sovereignty of the people is regarded as the condition precedent to all actual government, and the deposing power is justified on this theory. It is part of the *jus gentium* of Christian nations that the sovereign shall be a Catholic. Moreover, since St. Peter was ordered to feed the sheep of the Church, it is clear that the Pope has power to exclude the wolf from the State. Besides, Christ

[1] *De Justitia et Jure*, lib. ii. c. 4, d. 10. Cf. also Molina, Tr. III. Dis. i. and Jean de Salas, vii. § 2. The view here taken is that power of life and death comes from God, not the people, because man has no dominion over his own life.

[2] Adam Tanner, *Defensio Libertatis Ecclesiæ* II. cc. 3, 4, and De Salas, Disput. vii. § 2, 114.

[3] Becanus, *Controversia*, 150.

said that he came not to send peace on earth, but a sword, and to divide sons from fathers, and that must include separating sovereigns from their subjects.

Tyrannicide follows, a necessary result of the deposing power. Tyrants are of two kinds, usurpers or despots. The former of course may be slain; the latter only as public enemies after the whole republic has expressly or tacitly condemned them. Mariana puts in a proviso that any form of death is allowable save poison—apparently on the plea that that is to drive the tyrant unwittingly to suicide.[1] The king, however, is law-maker, above the coercive power of the laws, as also are the clergy, in the common opinion.

This brings us to the inquiry, What in the view of the Jesuits was the nature of law? Not all law is positive. There is eternal law in accordance with which the Divine nature everlastingly manifests itself. All other law is directly or remotely derived from this. There is natural law implanted in the reason of man, unalterable and universal. But we are not to take its permissions as commands. Thus in the state of nature men were free and equal and goods were common. These things were only allowed, and not enjoined, by natural law, which is thus not violated by the introduction of individual superiorities and private property. Natural law comes, in the general view, from God as a legislator. Vasquez makes it independent of Him.[2] The reason is curious. Natural law must be regarded as independent of God the sovereign, as being the embodiment not of caprice but of reason. It is thus used as a sort of fetter on the Divine action, in the same way that law conceived as traditional is regarded as independent of any human sovereign. The advocates of the common law of England in the seventeenth century, the believers in fundamental laws abroad, apparently had a similar reluctance to face the idea of sovereignty. Still, for many the conception of God as supreme legislator

[1] *De Rege*, i. 7.

[2] *Commentarii*, Disp. cl. 3; and see for a discussion of this point, Janet, *Histoire de la Science Politique*, ii. 57, sqq.

has vivid reality. (The feeling may explain something of Calvinism and the Divine decrees.) It is this which prevents an unjust or pernicious law from being truly law. It conflicts with the higher and unalterable code.

Then there is *jus gentium*. This is not quite the same as law natural. For instance, natural liberty and equality exist no longer in it. It may be as St. Thomas taught—that *jus gentium* is law derived from law natural by plain and obvious deductions, as *jus civile* (which must also be conformable to it) depends on circumstances differing among different nations. Jean de Salas thinks that *jus gentium* was the sovereign act of the whole human race at its entering upon a common life, and may not be repealed without universal consent.[1] Another view is that of Suarez,[2] Lessius,[3] and Castro-Palao,[4] who regard it, as do modern international jurists, as owing its force to custom, thus resting on the common consent and practice of civilised nations. It includes international law in one sense, and much more besides. Grotius looms before us.

But is positive law a command of the prince, so that the maxim holds, *Quod principi placuit legis dabit vigorem*? This is, of course, the view of all Austinians; for if you take the prince to mean the sovereign one or number, the definition would apply to any State. This conception and all that it involves is definitely rejected by the Jesuits and all holders of theories similar to theirs, save indeed so far as the Pope is concerned. Law is conceived as essentially reasonable. Stress is laid on its ethical content. It must not contradict law natural. It must be duly promulgated, capable of being obeyed, *just, directed to the common welfare*, perhaps, indeed, accepted by the people. Here, indeed, is a divergence. Most writers deny the need of popular acceptance. But they make such large allowance for the custom of non-obedience as practically repealing law, that they are not far from Hooker's doctrine, 'Laws they are not, which public appro-

[1] *De Legibus*, vii. 2, 3.
[2] *De Legibus*, ii. 19.
[3] *De Justitia et Jure*, lib. ii. c. 2, d. 3.
[4] *Theologia Moralis*, Tr. III. disp. I. p. 3.

bation hath not made so.' It is clear, however, that unjust laws are not laws, and need not be obeyed, and laws which are against general utility are a contradiction in terms. Thus law is regarded not so much as dependent on the will of the law-giver, as an attempt to realise under political conditions the teachings of natural law, the ideal to which all States should conform, and to ensure the reign of general utility and justice. The value of this conception is little. But it gives a much better ground than Hobbes or Austin can find for the distinction between laws and occasional commands of the sovereign. Nor is positive law thought of by most as law in any special sense, 'simply and strictly so called.' Vasquez, indeed, denies to natural or eternal law the title of *lex*, and would only call them *jus*.[1] Most, however, regard positive law as necessary, indeed, but distinctly subordinate. Eternal law, natural law, law of nations, are no whit less law than the civil laws of any State.

It was only in an age saturated with such sentiments as to the nature of law that either international law or the theory of the original compact could have made any way. The stress laid upon natural law made it possible to conceive of a state of society in which contracts had binding force, though positive law did not exist. This seems nonsense to us, as Austin showed. But it was only the vividness of their belief in natural law that could lead men to regard the State as having its origin in a definite contract between its members. So with regard to international law. That could not have arisen, at least in its present form, but for the widespread belief in natural law. Had men universally accepted the Austinian conception of law, which was held by supporters of the Divine Right of Kings, and comes out most strongly in Hobbes and Bodin, Grotius must have written in vain, or rather he would not have written at all. The 'De Jure Belli et Pacis' was possible, because the Jesuits had helped in popularising a way of looking at law which insisted on its ethical content and regarded it as the embodiment of reason.

[1] *Commentarii*, Disp. cl. 3.

Of Mariana's 'De Rege et Regis Institutione,' a few words must be said. It is in some respects unique. It breathes of constitutionalism, and its delicate sentimentalism suggests Rousseau rather than the English Whigs. It is no arid scholastic treatise. Touched with a refinement of literary grace, it has a charm for the student, wearied with the subtleties of Dicastillo or Molina. The book is written with no purpose of exalting the Church, although there is much complaint of alleged injustice to episcopal property.[1] Its direct aim is to teach constitutional doctrine to the young prince. It procured condemnation for its author; nor can we wonder at this. The tone, in which the murder of Henri III. is described, differs from a modern anarchist in little save the excellence of the style.[2] The noble savage makes an early appearance in this book. A picture is drawn of an idyllic paradise, a golden age of philosophic anarchy, in which laws and criminals are unknown, and nobody stole his neighbour's goods because nobody had any worth the stealing.[3] But alas! this could not continue. There follows an account of the genesis of government and an argument for a monarchy —limited, indeed. Taxation and part of the legislative power are beyond the competence of the prince, and the community is undoubtedly his superior.[4] The book seems aimed at reducing the Spanish King to a due sense of his own insignificance.

This is what strikes us all along in reading these authors. Large admissions are sometimes made in favour of government, but always with a grudge. The tone is one of habitual depreciation of the State. Tyranny, not anarchy, is the bug-

[1] *De Rege*, i. 10.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 6. Father Gerard asserted that there was only one sentence on this subject; and that this was expunged in the second edition. I have compared the two editions 1599 and 1605, and find that not only are there more than two pages about the matter, but that the only material alteration is that, in describing the death of Clement, the words 'æternum Galliæ decus, ut plerique visum est,' are omitted in 1605. There are two other slight verbal alterations in the chapter, and in describing Henry IV. the clause is changed to 'nunc *quod gaudendum in primis* mente mutatâ *Christianissimo* Galliæ regi.'

[3] *Ibid.* i. 599.

[4] *Ibid.* i. 8, 9.

bear. Wherever possible, limits are to be placed on the royal power. In no State has the actual governor fully sovereign authority. The similarity of these views with those of the Whigs and later opponents of State interference is remarkable. The State is regarded by all alike as a sort of dangerous lunatic, to be restrained from more than the minimum of governmental action. Locke and Sidney admit no real sovereign. Sidney tells us in words, that he might have paralleled in many Jesuit treatises, that what is not just is not law, and what is not law ought not to be obeyed.[1] Moreover, Sidney definitely mentions Bellarmin and Suarez—with contempt, indeed, as schoolmen and Catholics, but with respect as having lit upon the fundamental truths of politics.[2] Doleman's pamphlet was reprinted as a Whig *pronunciamiento* in the controversy concerning the Exclusion Bill, and was used by other writers, notably the author of the 'History of the Succession.' Thus the connection between Whigs and Jesuits is patent.[3] The original compact played, perhaps, more part in the Whig than in the Jesuit theorists. Still, it was always latent and frequently expressed in the latter. We hear, too, among the Jesuits of the notion of later times that individuals who do not like the laws of a State can leave it. But the root idea of both Whig and Jesuit doctrines is the same. Both are theories of the limits of State action. They were expressed in the form fit for those times—that laws which transgress these limits are not laws at all. Mill, of course, and Bentham avoided this error. And the original compact rests once more in its primæval obscurity. Yet Mill had the same innate desire to limit the action of the sovereign power. He is ever saying 'Hands off!' to the State. And

[1] Algernon Sidney, *Discourses on Government*, iii. § 11.

[2] *Ibid.* i. § 2.

[3] In one way Suarez (*De Legibus*, iii. 3) and Molina (III. i. 1) seem to be nearer Rousseau than Locke. Unlike both they place political power in the community by the act of God, as Author of nature, and not by a definite contract. But they seem to incline to the view expounded by Rousseau that kings and other governors are mere delegates of the sovereign people, and that there is no contract with them.

it may be questioned how far even Mill's emphatic language as to the spheres of thought and action which the State must leave free be not due to the tone of these earlier writers who strove to transform a moral into a legal incapacity. In opposition to the theory of the omnipotence of the State, and to all attempts to exalt and enlarge the province of government, we have counter-theories which insist on the duties rather than the rights of the State, which desire to guard against its encroachments. In some form or other these are found from the time of Hildebrand down to the individualism of which this generation seems like to see the last.

But there is another ground for this view of the connection between the schools. More than half of Mill's 'Liberty' is occupied with defending the rights of conscience and the duty of toleration. Now this seems to me to be the unconscious distinction of the Jesuits. I cannot doubt that supporters of the claims of Pope or presbyter were asserting the rights of conscience in a form suited to a day when toleration was undreamed of. It may be that neither Knox nor Bellarmin would care to be classed as heralds and instruments of the struggle for religious liberty. But they were. The first step towards freedom of conscience is to take away from the civil State, that power which is backed by physical force, the right of deciding at its own pleasure what opinions shall be encouraged and what shall be suppressed. It is a real advance when anybody possessing purely moral authority claims to decide these questions, to make its decision binding on the State. Now, this was the action of the Jesuits. They did not argue for toleration. Who did? But, like Knox and Goodman, they demanded that the civil State should not touch matters of faith apart from the spiritual power. They claimed freedom of faith—true, it was freedom for one faith only, but that was far better than the theory of Hobbes, which makes the State for its own ends the teacher of truth. The danger of the theory of the Divine Right of Kings, true and useful as it was in many respects, was in the direction of Erastianism. Against this the Jesuits set up a protest. They denied any

power in the State as such to decide religious matters. Suarez asserts that the right of persecution was merely granted to the State by the Church,[1] and one writer declares that the deposing power ought not to be exercised against a heretic unless he be persecuting his subjects in the interests of heresy ; and those who reverence the 'glorious, pious, and immortal memory' have small cause to censure this view. The Jesuits did not, indeed, proceed to the third and final stage of complete toleration. But by insisting on the necessary distinction between temporal and spiritual affairs they performed no unimportant service to the cause of truth, and hastened unwittingly the day when liberty of thought was to be the possession of all. It is hardly too much to say that had Boniface VIII. not promulgated the Bull 'Unam Sanctam,' we should never have had from John Stuart Mill the treatise on 'Liberty.'

Lastly we may note that it was just because the Jesuits were so strongly hierarchical in their conceptions of government, that they were among the first to develop the purely utilitarian and secular theory of the State. Separating in idea the civil power from the spiritual they discerned more accurately than other men the nature of the civil State as such.[2] They did not, like their adversaries, see the State surrounded by a halo. Visions of transcendent power and wisdom were reserved for the Papacy. Their State was no mortal god, supreme, the image before which all peoples, nations, and languages should bow down and worship. Any such view, says Gretser, is *Machiavellistica et Turcica.* The State is a contrivance, no more. Instituted for the common welfare, it may not pass beyond that. There is a large sphere of action, the highest, in which it may not interfere. It has no existence independent and immutable. Its constitution is not of God's ordinance. It lies at the mercy of the Pope.

[1] *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ.*

[2] Cf. Janet, ii. 63: 'Elle [la souveraineté du peuple] est surtout nvoquée par les partisans du pouvoir ecclésiastique, *très clairvoyants sur les limites du pouvoir politique.*'

Its power is defined by the original act of the sovereign people. In all probability it need not have existed had not men been so bad. It is no object of worship, but an instrument of use. Kingship again is not specially divine. The king holds an office, not a patrimony. He is minister not master of his people. Government is a trust, not a right.

There are conceptions not far from these of our own day. Men are willing to talk of the rights of peoples. Their theory of politics is utilitarian. They believe, or say they believe, in religious toleration. Until recently they held strong sentiments as to the limits of State interference. Let them, then, give honour where honour is due, and look unto the rock whence they are hewn. Modern politics may owe more than men think to a theory formed in times remote from ours, framed under very different conditions, clothing its substance in alien forms, and supporting its conclusions by obsolete arguments. None the less its essence is the same. We have no right to blame the one, so long as we admire the other.

No great movement in history is quite vain. It owes its force to the prominence which it gives to some neglected aspect of truth or some forgotten side of justice. The faults of the 'Society of Jesus' have been the occasion of many processes and more pamphlets. They stand to many for a byword of iniquity. Even in their own communion they have never been without bitter enemies. The Parlement of Paris was keener in its hostility than English divines. It is time to ask ourselves whether the Jesuits did no good. Fools they were not. Were they all knaves? It seems doubtful. Their influence in the realm of politics and secular affairs has become proverbial. Certain achievements therein have become the heritage of us all, and their value is past discussion. It has been the purpose of this paper to find their origin in not the least interesting side of the activities of this society. The evil which the Jesuits did has assuredly lived after them. I have tried to bring to light something of the good which has been too long interred with their bones.

A NARRATIVE OF THE PURSUIT OF ENGLISH REFUGEES IN GERMANY UNDER QUEEN MARY.[1]

BY I. S. LEADAM, M.A.

Read December 17, 1896

DOMINUS REX ET REGINA mandarunt hic breue suum sub Magno Sigillo suo Thesaurario et Baronibus huius scaccarii directum Cuiusquidem breuis tenor sequitur in hec verba. Philippus et Maria dei gracia Rex et Regina Anglie Hispaniarum Francie vtriusque Sicilie Ierusalem et Hibernie fidei defensores Archiduces Austrie Duces Burgundie Mediolani et Brabancie Comites Haspurgi Flandrie et Tirolis Thesaurariis et Baronibus suis de Scaccario salutem Tenorem cuiusdam certificacionis coram nobis in Cancellaria nostra retornate ac in filaciis eiusdem Cancellarie nostre de Recordo residentis vobis Mittimus presentibus interclusum Mandantes vt inspecto tenore certificacionis predicte vlterius inde pro nobis fieri faciatis prout de iure et secundum legem et consuetudinem Regni nostri Anglie fuerit faciendum. Testibus nobis ipsis apud Westmonasterium xxij^{do} die Octobris Annis regnorum nostrorum tercio et quarto.[2] Wa. Hare.[3] Et tenor certificacionis vnde in brevi predicto superius fit Mencio sequitur in hec verba.

To the moste Reverende Father in godde Nicholas

[1] MS. R. O. Exch. Q.R. Memoranda Roll, No. 338, Rot. 191. Adhuc Communia de termino sancti Michaelis Annis tercio et iiij^{to} Regis Philippi et Regine Marie. Adhuc Records.

[2] 1556.

[3] Presumably a clerk's signature. I can find no particulars of this person.

Archebisshopp of Yorke lorde Chancellour of Englande[1] and to the Court of Chauncerye. Thiese be to certifye your lordeshipp that I John Brett[2] Gentyllman servaunt to the King and Quenes moste excellent Maiestyes being depeched into the parties of beyonde the Seas by theire Maiestyes
1556 with Commyssyon dated the xvjth daye of June in the seconde and thirde yeare of theyr Maiestyes reignes to delyver unto the lady Katheryne Duches of Suffolke[3] Richard Barteue[3]

[1] Nicholas Heath, Bishop of Rochester 1540, Worcester 1544, deprived 1550; Archbishop of York 1555; Chancellor 1556–8; deprived of his see 1560; died 1579.

[2] The only mention of John Brett I have found in the *State Papers, Domestic*, H. VIII.–Eliz., or elsewhere, is 'a note of fines to be received by John Brett in Michaelmas Term 4 Eliz. (1561) from eleven persons named on surrender or transfer of lands &c., marking some as paid or denied' (*S. P. Dom.* Addenda Eliz. p. 527). If this be the same person, it is evident that he continued to be employed in the Government service.

[3] Katharine, Dowager-Duchess of Suffolk, Baroness Willoughby d'Eresby in her own right, married in 1536, at the age of sixteen, as his fourth wife, Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, a settlement being made upon her by Act of Parliament (28 H. VIII. c. 51). She was left a widow in 1545 with two sons, both of whom died of the sweating sickness in 1551. In 1552 she married Richard Bertie, son and heir of Thomas Bertie of Bersted, Kent, and sometime Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. The Duchess, although her mother was a Spaniard, had been zealous for the Reformed Faith during the reign of Edward VI., and specially hostile to Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. In 1554 Gardiner, who had become Chancellor, summoned Richard Bertie before him. The ostensible reason was a debt alleged to have been due from the late Duke to the King, but the main purpose appears to have been to induce Bertie to promise that the Duchess should conform to the re-established faith. An amusing conversation ensued, which is set out in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, evidently from Bertie's pen, the drift of which was that the Bishop complained of sundry personal affronts he had met with at the hands of the Duchess. 'I pray you,' said Gardiner, 'if I may ask the question of my lady your wife, is she now as ready to set up the Mass as she was lately to pull it down, when she caused in her progress a dog in a rochet to be carried and called by my name? Or doth she think her lambs now safe enough, which said to me, when I veiled my bonnet to her out of my chamber window in the Tower, that it was merry with the lambs, now the wolf was shut up? Another time, my lord her husband, having invited me and divers ladies to dinner, desired every lady to choose him whom she loved best, and so place themselves. My lady your wife, taking me by the hand, for that my lord would not have her to take himself, said that forasmuch as she could not sit down with my lord whom she loved best, she had chosen him whom she loved worst.' Bertie would give no undertaking, and, having himself procured licence to go abroad in order to obtain from the Emperor the repayment of money due to the Duke, he effected the escape of the Duchess on June 1, 1555. Bertie's dramatic narrative of their adventures, printed by

Sir Thomas Wrothe [1] knighte sir henry Nevell [2] knighte sir

Foxe, is thus summarised by Fuller: 'It would trouble one's head to invent more troubles than they had all at once, and it would break one's heart to undergo but half so many, seeing their real sufferings out-romanced the fictions of many errant adventurers' (*Church History*, viii. 16). They first found refuge at Wesel, where a son, whom they named Peregrine, was born, afterwards celebrated as a military commander in the Netherlands. Here they received a friendly warning from Sir John Mason, English Ambassador in the Netherlands, that Paget had set a scheme afoot to entrap them. They took refuge at Strasburg, and later at Weinheim, in the Rhenish Palatinate. In April 1557, when 'their necessaries began to fail them,' they accepted an invitation from Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland, 'in the earldom called Crozan, where master Berty with the duchess, having the king's absolute power of government over the said earldom, continued both in great quietness and honour till the death of Queen Mary.' The spelling of the name throughout the contemporary narrative intituled 'A Brief Discourse' is Bartue (see p. 121, n. 1, *infra*); in Strype, *Life of Sir John Cheke*, p. 95, Bertue.

[1] Sir Thomas Wroth, one of the principal gentlemen of Edward VI.'s bedchamber. 'The King had divers sober and learned men about him, gentlemen of his privy chamber, in whose wise and learned conversation he was much delighted and as much profited. . . . And whosoever of these was in greatest favour with him, surely Sir Thomas Wroth, a gentleman of the West, was one of those that received the largest share of benefits from him, for he not only knighted him, but heaped great wealth, honours, offices and possessions upon him.' A list of the grants of land to him in Middlesex, Essex, Herts, Somerset and elsewhere follows. Strype, *Eccl. Mem.* II. i. 387–9 (Oxford edit. 1822). In 1550 Edward VI. lost ten yards of black velvet to him, which he received by order from the King's wardrobe (*ibid.* 388). He was one of a commission of ten for enforcing martial law in 1552 (*ibid.* II. ii. 3); of another commission for inquiring into the revenues derived from the King's Courts (*ibid.* 207); and of a third empowered to make a general inquiry into the receipts and expenditure of the Crown (*ibid.* 209). He was also interested in theology, being present at private conferences on the Sacrament in 1551 between Sir John Cheke and Feckenham, afterwards Dean of St. Paul's and Abbot of Westminster (Strype's *Life of Cheke*, p. 69, Oxford edit. 1822). It is not surprising that under Mary he took refuge at Strasburg, where he was 'very helpful to those of his godly countrymen among whom he dwelt, and particularly to Bartholomew Trahern, late Dean of Chichester' (*Eccl. Mem.* III. i. 226, 232). He returned home on the accession of Elizabeth, enjoyed considerable favour with the Queen, sat in Parliament, and maintained a great house at Enfield in Middlesex, granted to him by Edward VI.

[2] Sir Henry Nevell was a gentleman of the Privy Chamber of Edward IV., knighted by him, together with Mr. Secretary Cecil and Sir John Cheke, in October 1551 (Strype's *Life of Cheke*, p. 66). In the following year he was the Court nominee for the representation of Berkshire in Parliament (*Eccl. Mem.* II. ii. 65). He received large grants of church lands in 1551 and 1552 (*ibid.* 229, and II. i. 485). He accompanied the Lord High Admiral Clinton's embassy to France in 1551 (*ibid.* II. i. 506). He was also an ecclesiastical commissioner. He married Elizabeth Bacon, widow of Sir R. Doyle (*Annals*, II. ii. 210).

William Stafforde[1] knight Anthony Meyres[2] Esquyer Edwarde Isac[3] Esquyer William Fyeneux[4] Esquyer Rogyer Whetnall[5] Esqwyer John Hales[6] and Jane Wylkyn-

[1] Sir William Stafford, a member of Edward VI.'s Privy Council, was the leading personage after Lord Clinton in the embassy to France (*Eccl. Mem.* II. i. 507). See further p. 129, *infra*.

[2] Antony Meyres or Meres, Esq., of the county of Lincoln, having been presented for not receiving the Sacrament at Easter 1556, was cited before Cardinal Pole, but fled, and was pronounced excommunicate (*Eccl. Mem.* III. i. 483, ii. 390).

[3] Edward Isac esquier of Wel, Kent (Strype is uncertain whether it is Edward or Edmund), had as early as 1532 been an associate of heretics and a friend of Bishop Latimer (*Eccl. Mem.* i. 373). He seems to have been a person of considerable wealth, for in 1550, in conjunction with another, he purchased church lands in Suffolk, Somerset, Devon, London, Cambridge, Cornwall, and Dorset (II. i. 368). He fled to Frankfort about 1554, 'at whose hired house in this town were harboured Richard Chambers and Thomas Sampson, late Dean of Chichester' (III. i. 231). He was one of the principal opponents of Knox, then Minister to the Frankfort refugees, on account of his language against Queen Mary, which was the cause of Knox leaving Frankfort in 1555 (*ibid.* 406).

[4] William Fyneux, Esq., of Herne, Kent, son and heir of Sir John Fyneux, C.J. of the King's Bench 1495–1525, by Elizabeth, widow of William Cleere and daughter of Sir John Paston. William Fyneux died in 1557, in which year his will was proved. Apparently, therefore, he had returned to England and conformed. (Foss's *Lives*, v. 165; Hasted's *Hist. Kent*, iii. 623, n. 5.)

[5] Roger Whetnall, Esq., perhaps of Besthorp, Norfolk (Blomfield, i. 497). Thomas and George Whetnall appear as signatories of a letter from the congregation at Frankfort to that at Strasburg on December 3, 1554 (*A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort in the year* 1534; reprinted, London, 1846, p. xxvi).

[6] John Hales. Strype, *Eccl. Mem.* (Oxford, 1822), vol. II. pt. i. ch. xxi. p. 268, describes the John Hales of Somerset's Inclosure Commission of 1548 as 'clerk of the hanaper,' and after telling us that he was an exile at Frankfort during the time of Queen Mary (*ibid.* III. i. 405) adds that he was replaced as clerk of the hanaper to Queen Elizabeth (*Annals*, I. i. 74). This has been followed by Dugdale and all subsequent writers, including Miss Lamond in her edition of *The Common Weal of this Realm of England* by W. S., ascribed by her to John Hales. Dugdale says of John Hales that he was 'an active man in those days and clerk of the Hamper (an office then of no small benefit),' who 'accumulated a great estate in monastery and chantry lands,' and founded a grammar school in Coventry' (*Warwickshire*, ed. 1765, p. 119; cf. Miss Lamond's 'Introduction,' pp. xxi, xxvi, xxviii). Miss Lamond finds confirmation of Strype's statement in the negative evidence that the Acts of the Privy Council show that while payments were made to John Hales, 'apparently in his capacity of Clerk of the Hanaper in 1547 and 1548—the last on February 25, 1549—his name does not appear in the subsequent volumes.' Yet there is no trace of any other person holding the office. Now while it is certain that under Edward VI. a John Hales was clerk of the Hanaper, it is scarcely less certain that this person was not John Hales of Coventry, the

friend of Somerset and chairman of the Commission on Inclosures of 1548–9. The evidence is both positive and negative. We know that John Hales of Coventry took refuge at Frankfort at the accession of Mary (Strype, *Mem.* III. i. 405). He had anticipated trouble in 1550, after the fall of his patron, Somerset, for we find him on January 4, 1551, conveying away the greater part of his large property to trustees, evidently in preparation for flight, doubtless on account of the hostility of Northumberland arising out of his action as commissioner to inquire into inclosures. In August 1553, a month after Mary had ascended the throne, he conveyed away all the rest. These facts we learn from the finding of the jury in 1557 upon the Inquisition into his lands &c. prior to confiscation, at which time the jury returned 'nulla bona' in Coventry or Warwickshire. (MS. R. O. Exch. Q. R. Mem. Roll 338, H. T. 3 and 4 P. & M. (1557), m. 176 i & ii, ii dorso, iii, iii dorso & iv). Miss Lamond shows us (p. xxvi) that in 1550 he was perhaps at Zurich (*Original Letters*, Parker Society, Nos. 99, 100, pp. 188, 189), and certainly at Strasburg in 1552 (Cranmer, *Works*, p. 435, Letter 299). Possibly the fall of Northumberland in July 1553 emboldened him to pay a brief visit to England for the purpose of winding up his affairs in expectation of a protracted exile. Now, if the duties of Clerk of the Hanaper have been correctly set out—'the business of this officer is to receive all moneys due to the king for the seals of charters, patents, commissions &c., and the fees of enrolling. In Term Time he is to attend the Lord Chancellor daily, and at all times of sealing, receiving all charters &c. after they are sealed [put up in leather bags, sealed with the Chancellor's private seal], which are to be delivered to the Controuler of the Hanaper' (T. Sharp, *History of Coventry*, 1871, p. 166, n.)—it is inconceivable that the political enemies of Hales would have suffered him to retain this lucrative office from 1551 to 1557, when his absence from the country afforded them the ready plea that it was impossible for him to perform its duties. Nevertheless, we find among the Exchequer inrolments of 1555 'De compoto Radulphi Sadlyer & Johannis Hales custodum siue clericorum hanapii cancellarie Regis & Regine.' These two, one of them being on the accepted hypothesis absent in Germany, account for the large sum of 5821*l.* 7*s.* 1½*d.*, which had passed through their hands between Michaelmas 1553 and Michaelmas 1554. In 1556 John Bret, the author of this narrative, was sent to Frankfort to deliver a royal letter commanding John Hales and other refugees to return to England (MS. R. O. Exch. Q. R. Mem. Roll 338, M. T. 3 and 4 P. & M. m. 191). In Michaelmas Term of the same year (1556) the commission was issued to Sir Fulk Grevyle and others to seize all his lands, goods, and chattels in Warwickshire, Leicestershire, and the city of Coventry into the hands of the king and queen (*ibid.* inter commissiones), yet in the following summer, Trinity Term, 1557, we find Sir Ralph Sadler and John Hales, Esquire, described as before, delivering their account for 4089*l.* 8*s.* 11*d.* from Michaelmas 1555 to Michaelmas 1556, and that in the summer of 1557 John Hales, the Clerk of the Hanaper, was still in enjoyment of his office appears from the recital that he and his colleague are accountable for the receipts of 1556–1557 (*ibid.* T. T. m. 92). Pawle or Powle, whom Miss Lamond seems to suppose to have been Hales's successor, is mentioned in this document as the comptroller and supervisor of the office to whom the accounts were rendered. When those for 1556–57 are delivered the clerks are Sir Ralph Sadler and Francis Kempe, gentleman (*ibid.* Roll 339, E. T. 4 and 5 P. & M. m. 4 dorso). If, on the other hand, we turn to contemporary documents, we find John Hales, the friend of Somerset, invariably described as of Coventry, but never as Clerk of the Hanaper.

son [1] wydowe their Maiesties subiects resyding in the sayde parties of beyonde the seas certeyne letters and commaundementes under their Maiestyes pryvy seale haue folowed and executed the same Commission and chardge commytted unto me with my beste diligence in mannour and forme as ensueth. Fyrste upon Wednisday the eighte day

In an Act of Parliament of 1580 'for perfecting of Assurances of certain Lands towards the maintenance of a free gramer schole within the City of Coventry' he is called 'John Hales, late of your said Cyttie, Esq.,' and also 'John Hales the elder.' Lastly, his epitaph given by Strype makes no mention of him as Clerk of the Hanaper (*Annals*, II. i. 352).

But there was a Clerk of the Hanaper of the name, and about six months after the confiscation of the goods of John Hales of Coventry he seems to have vacated his office. John Hales of Coventry was the younger son of Thomas Hales of Hales Place, Halden, Kent. But there was another branch of the family settled at Canterbury, in which the name of John occurs. This branch also, of which the most notable representative was Sir James Hales, the judge, was also well affected to the Protestant party. Now we know that John Hales of Coventry had a nephew John, who inherited his house there, the uncle being unmarried. It is presumably by way of distinction from this nephew that he was called 'Hales with the club-foot.' Whether this be so or not, it is highly probable that the vindictiveness of M ry against the Protestant party would not have suffered the retention of a lucrative crown appointment by the nephew of a leader among the refugees, or by any member of a family more than one of which was known to be sympathetic with heresy. The retirement of the Clerk of the Hanaper six months after the confiscation of the property of John Hales of Coventry, while it marks a line of distinction between the two, is very much what might have been expected under the circumstances. The same clerk who had been deprived would for the same reasons naturally be reinstated under Elizabeth.

[1] One of this name 'that was silkwoman' to Queen Anne Boleyn, 'a gentlewoman not now alive,' is eulogised by Foxe as 'of great credit and also of fame for her worthy doings' while at Anne's Court. It is possible that this is the same Mrs. Wilkinson described by Strype as 'a woman of good quality and a great reliever of good men.' 'Her the Archbishop out of prison advised to escape' (*Mem. of Cranmer*, p. 449). Strype prints the Archbishop's letter at full length in the Appendix (*ibid.* p. 916). She is recorded by Strype as one of those charitable persons who succoured in their need the Protestant prisoners in the King's Bench (*Eccl. Mem.* III. i. p. 223). Among the 'comperta' of Cardinal Pole on his metropolitical visitation of the see of Lincoln, 'Magistra Wilkinson' is mentioned as having the impropriation of Kimbeltoune (cf. III. ii. 404). She probably died at Frankfort, for on July 25, 1557, Edmond Sutton speaks of her as 'good Mistress Wilkinson off blessed memorie,' and mentions that 'she put Horne and Chambers in truste with the deuisinge and makinge of hir will, whereby she gave to this and other poore congregations of the poore banished Englishmen a Christian liberall relief' (*A Brief Discourse*, p. clxxviii). She left a daughter living at Frankfort (*ibid.*).

of July laste paste before the daye of this certifycat I pre- 1556
sentyd theire Maiesties letteres vnder the prevy Seale to Jane Wilkynson wydowe at Franckeforde in Almaigne in the presence of one Chambers[1] John Ade[2] and William Woodde[3] englisshmen whiche she receaved as it semyd humblye saieng that albeit her indisposycion and sekenes was cause of her comming oute of England to see if she coulde recover her healthe at the Bathes in those Countreys, yet considering it pleased the Quenes Maiesty to call her home she wolde repayre towardes England with the best spede she coulde, for lothe she wolde be she sayde that any person sholde be combered for her cause. The sayde eighte daye of July and in the same Towne of Franckeforde I the sayde Brett wente to make delyuery of lyke letteres to John

[1] Chambers, *i.e.* Richard Chambers, who 'did in King Edward's days expend great sums of money in charity, which ran in two streams, one towards the supply of such as were students in the universities, and the other towards other godly poor. For he was a great favourer of learning and a friend to the oppressed. In the reign of that king he visited both Cambridge and Oxford, allowing pensions to many hopeful young men there. At Oxford he afforded 6*l.* a year to Mr. Jewel to buy divinity books, and exhorted him to set his mind intensely upon that study. For he did not only relieve the wants of the needy, but greatly edified them by his counsel. And commonly when he was disposed to charity he took a preacher with him, who instructed the receivers of his bounty and admonished the students of their duty; which office Peter Martyr sometimes performed and sometimes Jewel. . . . And the said Chambers, being afterwards an exile at Frankford, continued his good deeds, in helping and succouring the students and poorer sort of the English nation there.' (*Eccl. Mem.* III. i. 225.) He was, with Grindal, selected as agent to the Strasburg exiles to treat with those at Frankfort about the English service book (*id. Life of Grindal*, p. 14). He died in England in 1566 (*Annals* I. ii. 544).

[2] 'Maister Ade' appears to have been elected in 1557 to an office in the church at Frankfort, but declined to serve (*A Brief Discourse*, p. xcvij). His signature appears as John Ade on December 21, 1557 (*ibid.* cxxxv).

[3] 'In the yere of oure lorde 1554 & the 27 off June came Edmonde Sutton, William Williams, William Whittingham & Thomas Wood with their companies to the citie off Franckford in Germany the firste Englishe men that there arrived to remaine & abide' (*A Brief Discourse*). There was another member of the congregation in 1557 named Henry Wood (*ibid.* cxxxiv). In 1556 Thomas Wood separated from the congregation at Frankfort and went to Geneva (T. Fuller, *Christ. Hist.* iv. 221, Oxford ed. 1845). I find no William Wood among the refugees. A person of this name, a baker, of Stroud, Kent, afterwards vicar of Suddenham, was indicted for heresy in 1554, but released (Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, viii. 567, 729).

Hales whiche he refused disobediently to receave saying Minatory and with threates that the Quenes Maiesty had no power to sende proces into those parties nor I to present them as I sholde well perceyve to my paynes er my departure thence. But in effecte after many hotte wordes and meanes used by the sayde Hales howe to have rydde me owte of his doores with the saide letteres I lefte them with hym in the presence of one Sutton[1] his Compaignon Chrystofer Hales[2] his brother and the said William Wodde englisshmen. And afterwardes I toke the way towardes my lodging. The saide John Hales Sutton and Chrystofer Hales gyrte theyre Swordes aboute them and gotte them to the Consules howse of Franckeforde. To the saide Consull[3] the saide John Hales made a greate complaynte howe the Quenes Maiesty contrary to the liberties and lawes of those Countreys hadde sente to vexe hym and others that for theyr refuge and concyens sake were commed thyther to flye persecucion in Englande requiring the sayde Consull as well for the conservacion of their Auncyente liberties as that he and others mighte lyve there with safe conscyencys not onely that I the sayde Brett the Quenes Maiesties Messenger

[1] Sutton; cf. p. 119, n. 3, *supra*. Sutton appears, from a letter addressed by John Hales to thirteen persons, members of the Frankfort congregation, on January 26, 1557, to have been one of the principal members of the English Church there. On July 25, 1557, he wrote a circular letter with the object of collecting alms for the relief of the poor English refugees in Frankfort (*A Brief Discourse*, pp. lxv, cxxxiii, clxxiv).

[2] Christopher Hales was present in 1551 at the private disputation on the Sacrament between Cheke and Feckenham at Cecil's house (see p. 115, n. 1, *supra*; Strype, *Mem. of Cranmer*, p. 386). Strype, in his *Life of Grindal* (p. 12), mentions Mr. Hales among those who fled to Strasburg in 1553. This is perhaps Christopher, whose name only appears at the end of a list of the principal members of the Frankfort congregation in 1557 (*Brief Discourse*, p. lxv). He may therefore have migrated thither from Strasburg with the purpose of joining his brother John (see p. 117, *supra*). He does not appear to have been a person of any mark.

[3] After searching through A. Kirchner, *Geschichte der Stadt Frankfurt a.M.* (Frankf. 1807, 2 vols.), with the aid of G. W. Pfeiffer's *Repertorium* (Frankf. 1856), I have failed to find that 'Consul' was a title in use. The city was governed by a Bürgermeister and Rath, the latter the 'Councell' of this narrative.

shoulde be compellyd to take again the letteres I had lefte in his house but that I sholde be punysshed for putting in vre her Maiestyes commaundement and furwith arrested. To the arrestment the sayde Consull consentyd and ymmediatly sent an offycer of his to myne Inne to comaunde me that the nexte daye at viij of the Clock I sholde appere afore the Councell in the Towne howse. My requeste to Thoffycer was to bring me at that instante to the said Consules presence for the knowing of his pleasure whiche he dyd accordingly. The Consull after I had tolde hym that I was the Quenes Maiestyes servaunte oppened vnto me in the said John Hales his presence the complayntes he hadde made againste me. I tolde the Consull that me thoughte it no derogacion at all to their libertyes that the Quenes Maiesty my Mistrys shoulde wryte vnto her owne subiectes abyding within theyr domynyons nor no cause why I shoulde be deteyned till the next morninge sythen I came to moleste no subiecte of theyrs but to delyuer letteres to Englisshmen from the Quenes Maiesty theyr soueraigne Mistris to theyre great comfortes if godde gaue them grace well and wisely to weye it. After thies and other lyke wordes vsed to the Consull he made the sayde John Hales this resolute aunswere: That sithen he was no subiecte of theyrs he colde by no iustyce stay me the said Brett any lenger then I luste abyde neyther wolde he do it for all the prayers or complayntes the saide Hales and his Compaignons coulde make hym. And so the Consull gently dysmyssed me. After this I repayred to the Duches of Suffolk and her husbande Richarde Barteue which persons resyde in Germany in an olde Castell scytuate upon the topp of a hill nighe unto a Towne of the Palsegraves callyd Weinhem.[1] At that

[1] 'After that Mr. Bartue and the dutches of Sulff. were safely arrived at Wezell in Westphalia, the brute theroff was the cause that moo Englishe people in shorte time resorted thither. It pleased God also that M. Couerdale (after that he had bin withe the king of Denmark) should come to the same Towne, who preached there no longe tyme, till he was sent for by woulgange duke off bypont, to take the pastorall charge off Bargzater, one of his Townes off Germany, at whose comminge to the duke, he made it knowen, bothe to himselff

Towne I arryved on Fryday the xth of July afore mencioned and leavinge my horses there in an Inne I went uppe the hill a good half englysshe myle highe a foote accompanyed with myne owne servaunte and a man of the Towne to shew us the waye. When I came afore the Castell gates I founde them faste shitte and a stryplynge lyke an englisshe lakey standing afore them. Of hym I demaunded if the sayde Duches and Barteue were within. The said lackey aunsweryd me yea and had scarsely spoken this worde but one loking oute of a Grate in the gate asked who I was and what I wolde haue. I tolde hym that I wolde gladly speake with the saide Duches and Bartue and that I had letters to delyver them from certayne their fryndes: he demaunde me eftsones my name and I tolde it hym. Then he badde me to tary at the gate and he wolde goe tell the Duches of me. And with that he and[1] Compaignon of his wente a spedy pace towardes the inwarde partes of the Castell. In the meane space whiles they came ageyne wee without the gates mighte heare a noyse of laieng downe stones in the wyndowe of a lyttell Turret over the Gate and casting uppe our eyes wee sawe one or two loke oute as tho they had bene lothe to have ben seene whiche ymmedyatly after began to crye in Frenche kyll them kyll them, with this wee harde allso folkes comming towardes the gate and I began to approche it on the oute syde, when they alofte

and to other noble men abowt him off M.B. and the dutches beinge in the Lowe countries. They vnderstandinge the daunger that might come vnto them in those partes, as also calling to remembrance what great curteisie strangers had founde in Englande at the dutches handes, made offre that iff they were forced to remoue or otherwise if it pleased them, they should haue the Castle of Winehaim by Hedleberge within the liberties of Otto Henricus then Palsgraue and a godly Prince, who most gladly (as well appeared) gaue consent to the same. M. Bartue and the Dutches acceptinge this offre, lefte Wezell and came vp to the saide Castle and there continued, till leauinge Germany they traueled towardes the lande off Pole' (*A Brief Discourse*, p. clxxxv). 'The Weinheim vineyard is situate in the environs of the town at the entrance to the romantic valley of the Birkenau . . . and commanded by the old ruined castle of Windeck, remarkable for its cylindrical donjon tower' (Murray, *Handbook to the Rhine and North Germany*, ed. 1886, p. 384). Otto Heinrich, Palsgrave 1556–59, a zealous friend of the Reformation (see *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Leipzig, 1887, vol. xxi. p. 713).

[1] *Sic.*

with a lowder voyce cryed as they had done afore and caste downe a stone. I stode styll And forthwithe they caste downe an other stone. My hap was that it missed my heade but it hat me so bigge a blowe on the righte hande that I colde not rule my forefynger and thombe a fortenighte after. And ymmediatly certen of the Duches servauntes russhed oute of the gate with great fearsenes I wat not howe many so that yt seemed vnto vs highe tyme to retyre thence or to tary there by force. Some caste stones after me and my manne from the stepe hill topp others to the nombre of sixe folowed vs tyll we came into the market place of the Towne afore my lodginge where a lyttle afore my commyng one of the saide Duches men had drawen his Swerde againste my Manne but he wisely toke the howse: that made better for our matters afterwardes. Of a long tyme while I wyste not where my Manne was becommed when fowre of the saide vnrewly persons wolde haue hayled me uppe to the Castell agayne by force: at our struggelinge withoute drawing any weapon dyvers of the Towne began to gether aboute vs in whose presence the englisshe menne cryed to move the people againste me and my Man that we were thevys and papistes commed into those partyes with purpose to cary awey the Duches theyre lady or by some secret meane to poyson her and theyr Master favourers of the Gospell and truthe. But in the beste Duche I colde I dyd the people tonderstand that theyr Childisshe exclamacions were false and that I came thither to trye no Matyers with weapon in hande but in a moste honest and iuste cause as they sholde well knowe afterwardes nor to the confusion of their lady as they alleged but rather to her singuler comforte and all theyrs that were there yf they beare as became them trewe hartes towardes theyr Countrey. Whilste the Matters passed in this sorte two of the sayde Duches menne caryed my two geldinges from myne Inne by myne Ostes consent uppe to the Castell and disposed of them at theyre pleasures the space of viij dayes folowing withoute other remedy to be had at their handes. Anone came a

hedd offycer of the Towne callid Kelder[1] in the Duche tonge and in laten Cellarius Principis. The saide lewde Englysshmen reioysed not a lyttle to see hym come who by all lykelyhod was almoste made to theyr owne lewre. To hym they saide so well as theyr language wolde serve them how the Quenes Maiestie had sent me the sayd Brett thither to moleste their lady and Maister within those domynyons in dispite of the Palsegrave and in contempte of the libertyes of those Countreys. I tolde the sayde Kelder they saide malycyously and falsely of the Quenes Maiesties mening towardes the Duches and her husband and allso towardes the Palsegrave, for quod I her Maiestie hath wryten vnto them suche letteres as are rather a demonstracion of favour towardes them her Subiectes then of any displeasure and that her Maiestie ment nothing les then despyte towardes the Palsgrave. I saide euerybody mighte esely perceave in that she knewe not at my departure oute of Englande whether the sayde Duches was within the precynctes of his Countryes or no. The kelder axed me wherfore I made hym not prevy to the matyer er I wente to delyuer the letteres whereunto I the sayde Brett aunsweryd hym that me thought it nedeles sithen they were the Quenes Maiesties subiectes to whome they were directed and that by delyuery of them no preiudyce coulde happen to any person in those partyes. But those wordes stode me in litle stede at that tyme for furthwith as tho I had bene half condemned my cause vnharde the saide Kelder commytted me and my Manne that then was commed to me ageyne to the custody of certen kepers to tary in an Inne till his returne agayne from the saide Duches and that he had knowen her pleasure in that had passed. All thies thinges happened in the presence of the moste in the Towne besydes many brave bragges and depe othes whereby those Englisshemen declared theyre meaninge towardes me theyr disobedyent and harde hartes towardes the Quenes Maiestie

[1] I have failed to find the word Kelder either in Graff, *Althochdeutscher Sprachsatz*, or Wilhelm Müller, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, or in M. Lexer, *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*.

and her honorable Councell. Amongest them were two englisshmen surnamed Turpyn [1] and Goslinge [2] an other was callid Chrystofer [3] the others I coulde not heare them ones named in all theyr talke together but one of them had dwelt in Dertmouth. But to retorne to the Keldar ageyne, after he had consulted the mattyer above in the Castell with the sayde Duches and Bartue lyttle lack of three howres he came to me ageyne where he lefte me and with hym Barlowe [4] and three or fowre englisshmen mo. The saide Barlowe tolde me the sayd Brett that [5] was commed to speake with me on the behalf of the sayd Duches and Bartewe who had gevin hym in charge to knowe whether the letteres I broughte were from the Quenes Maiesty or not and whether they were letteres Myssyves or processe, for if they were letteres he sayde they wolde receave them but in case they were proces they wolde not receave them sithen they were within an other Prynces

[1] There were two refugees of this name. One of them, John Turpin, belonged to the Frankfort congregation in 1557, and nothing further is known of him (see *A Brief Discourse*, p. cxxxiii). The other was Thomas Turpyn, an exile for religion at Arrow in Switzerland in 1559 (Strype, *Ann. Ref.* I. i. 154): perhaps the person of the same name who was ordained deacon by Archbishop Grindal in 1560, and priest by Pilkington, Bishop of Durham in 1561, on which occasion he was described as 'born in Calais' (*Life of Grindal*, pp. 73, 74).

[2] Goslinge. This was perhaps the 'Gosling, a merchant of London,' dwelling at Leigh, Essex, who assisted the Duchess to escape (Foxe, viii. 572).

[3] Christofer. I can find no particulars of this person.

[4] William Barlow, successively Bishop of St. Asaph, St. David's, Bath and Wells, and Chichester. He was brought up as an Austin canon at St. Osyth's, Essex, and at the house of the Order in Oxford, and became prior of Bromehill, the suppression of which house caused him to write violent attacks on Wolsey and the Church generally. After retracting these he ingratiated himself with the Court, and especially with Anne Boleyn, who procured him the priory of Haverfordwest. He now became an ardent reformer, and in 1536 was made Bishop of St. Asaph, from which he was almost immediately translated to St. David's. In the same year he was ambassador to Scotland. During the reign of Edward VI. he threw himself zealously into the reforming movement, and in 1548 was translated by Somerset to the see of Bath and Wells. In 1550 he married. He was imprisoned in the Tower on Mary's accession, but was either released or escaped to Germany, where, according to Fuller, he became minister to an English congregation at Embden. This document throws a new light upon his movements. Upon Elizabeth's accession he returned to England, assisted in the consecration of Parker, and in 1559 was made Bishop of Chichester, where he died in 1568 (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*).

[5] *Sic.*

domynyons. And for my vsinge at the Castell he sayde bothe his lady meaninge the Duches and Master Bartewe were discontentyd with theyr servauntes. I aunsweryd hym that my receaving at the Castell was in dede very symple as he mighte well perceave by the signe I had broughte thence on my hande and moche otherwise then I thoughte it sholde have bene for I perswaded myself that I sholde haue had to do with good and lovinge Englysshemen and not to haue had suche repulse and villany at theyr handes. Concerning the letteres I sayed they were sente from the quenes Maiestie to the Duches and Bartewe. The sayd Barlowe pressed me eftsones to knowe whether they were letteres or proces. I saide they were letteres and gyven me for letters and for letteres wolde I delyuer them, he wolde that I sholde have made delyuery of them to hym I tolde hym he sholde pardon me for I was comaunded to delyuer them according to theyr direccions. He sawe that by no meanes he colde wreste oute of me whether the letteres were proces or not. He began to threaten me saieng that I mighte well repent myself for my presumpcion in taking vpon me suche an enterprise in case my letteres were founde to be proces. He wolde haue had me to haue shewed them to hym for seinge them he saide he wiste well whether they were proces or not but I ment nothinge les. Then he saide I showlde not chuse but shewe them er my departinge. Myne aunswer was that I trusted it sholde be by reason and iustice if any require the sighte of them at my handes. Yes sir quod he that shall you shewe them together with the Comyssyon how you comme into thies partyes to troble any body heare. Then he callid the said Kelder and tolde hym that it sholde be requisite to see what writinges or letters I had and what I had to shewe for myself for what wiste they he sayde whether I was the quenes servaunte or not, or fledd oute of Englande for treason, or rather sente into those partyes for a spye. The saide Kelder as one allmoste redye to gratyfye hym and his Company in all thinges commaunded me in the Palsegraves name that I sholde shewe my Commyssyon and make

delyuery to hym of all suche letteres as I had. I tolde hym I had no comission but letteres of quenes Maiestye wrytten in my favour suffycient to shewe that I was her highnes servaunte and no suche mannour of Manne as the saide Englysshmen surmysed I shulde be which letters I laid afore hym and they were redde. By those letters the Kelder said he sawe I was the quenes Maiestyes servaunt and then comaunded me ageyne to make delyuery of all the other letters whiche I had broughte with me. I made hym aunswer that I had but very fewe letteres and those wryten unto the quenes subiectes and therfore as me thoughte no reason why he sholde requyre the same at my handes nor therin do the Palsegrave any pleasure or servyce. The kelder saied he demaunded not the letteres of me to shew them to any person but because he wolde be sure I sholde deliuer none of them till the Palsegraves pleasure were perfectly knowen therin. The said Englisshemen required hym so earnestly to see the letteres that there was no remedy but I muste nedes deliuer them and beinge redy to ryffle me I sayde to the Kelder I wolde obey the commaundement he had made in the Palsegraves name sithen he was his Justice in that place hopinge that the letteres sholde be showyd to no man withoute the Palsgraves specyall commaundement and in my presens. Then went I to my man that had a Boxe in his bosome with fyve of the Quenes Maiesties letteres well bounde uppe in it. I toke it forthe saienge that therin were all the letteres I broughte with me requiringe the saide Kelder that I moughte set my seale upon the same and that it were not openid but in my presence as afore he had promysed me. The kelder gave me his hande and sayde that that sholde be performyd. And so I delyuerid the Boxe into his handes surely sealyd. The said englisshemen requested that I mighte be warely loked vnto for writinge or goinge awey which they easely obteyned but so colde not I to haue my horses ageyn that the Duches menne had ledd awey so I remayned as a prysoner with my kepers in an Inne where I was very evell lodged and entreatyd till Tewesday

the xvth day of Julye when newes were sent me that the Palsegrave had sent for me ij menne at Armes to come to heydelberge a Towne where moste comenly he resydeth twoo good leagues from Weynhem. I sent to pray the said Kelder that he woulde sende for my horses to the Castell that I mighte ryde in company of those horsemen that came for me. But this was in vayne for the Kelder sent me worde and afterwardes broughte me the lyke mesage hymself that I muste goo thither a foote with my kepers in company of the horsemen. I prayed hym that at leaste I mighte haue horsses for my money or elles a wagen otherwise I assured hym they sholde dragge me thither for I wolde not go so farre a fote. At laste a carte was gotten with muche adoo and after the Kelder had delyueryd me the Boxe agayne with letteres as he receavid it I departed towardes Hedelberg with sixe that wayted upon me. At Heydelberg I was deteyned agein xviij dayes so evill lodged and used as I had bene afore through the continuall seutes of thenglisshmen whose dryftes were altogether that I mighte have bene stayed there three or fowre Monethis after they had ones obteyned that I sholde deliuer none of the quenes Maiestyes letteres to any englisshman within the Palsegraves domynyons and that I sholde paye for all my charges and my kepers the tyme of my deteynment. This sentence was signified vnto me by two doctours of the Palsegraves Councell as the Palsegraves resolute Aunswere in my cause the xxijth daie after I the sayde Brette was fyrste stayed at Weynehem vnto the saide sentence. The saide doctours added that the Palsegrave had taken the saide Duches and her husbande in fidem tutelam et proteccionem suam and that therfore he wolde defende them and thothers that had submytted themselves to hym the sayde Palsegrave. But when the Englisshe menne sawe that nether by Reason lawe or friendshipp I colde be stayed any lenger in theys partyes they wente aboute bothe with fayre meanes and menaces to perswade me contrary to my duty and allegiaunce not to make reporte of my service and what for the same had behappenyd me but to accepte some

condicion in those Countreys vsing for theyre chief instrumentes in that behalf one Tremayne [1] and an other Englisshman whose name I take to be Saule [2] sometyme a scholler in Magdaleyne Colledge in Oxforde. The said Tremayne and Saule attempted also to suborne my servaunte with some offres and promises vnto hym to provide well for his wife in England and that they mighte have more commodyus accesse to comen with my saide servaunte in thies mattyers my horses were sent me from the saide Duches Castell to Heydelberg that he mighte kepe them. When all theyr practises toke no place they thoughte eftsones to have used me with force whiche I mighte well perceave by certayne that lay in wayte to do me displesure after I was at liberty and therfore departing from Heydelberg aforesaid the laste day of July I toke the way not towardes Wormes as I pretendid for to haue done but through the forest towardes Spyres. Afterwardes for better excucion of my chardge and to eschewe the perilles entended againste me I toke my waye towardes Italy by the Postes and arryved at Venyce on Sonday the xvjth daye of Auguste where I vnderstode that sir Henry Nevell was retorned into Englande that sir William Stafforde was deade in Geneva and that Maister Feneux was departed from Padua towardes Englande the thirde day of Auguste laste paste in company of Goodolphyn [3] the lorde of Bedfordes manne and of ij others Englisshmen thone callid Bodley [4]

[1] In April 1556 Richard and Nicholas Tremain, being implicated in a plot against the Government, were proclaimed traitors, but contrived to escape (*Eccl. Mem.* III. i. 487).

[2] Arthur Saule was a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 'which of all the rest in that University seemed most addicted to the Gospel' (*Eccl. Mem.* III. i. 82). Gardiner, as visitor, expelled fourteen or fifteen members of the Foundation, beginning with the President (*ibid.*), Saule being one of them. He took refuge at Strasburg, and appears as one of the signatories of a letter to the congregation at Frankfort on November 23, 1554 (*A Brief Discourse*, &c., p. xxiii). He returned to England on the accession of Elizabeth, and was one of those who subscribed the Articles of 1562.

[3] Goodolphyn. I have failed to find any particulars of this person.

[4] John Bodleigh was an exile in Geneva for religion (*Eccl. Mem.* II. i. 233), forming one of Knox's congregation, and being 'no small staie as well to that

thother a merchante mans sonne of London. Havinge certeyne intelligens of thies things at Venyce and Padua I repayred towardes the partyes of Germany agayne and the laste day of August came to Strawsbourg where as I was informed I thought to have founde sir Thomas Wrothe. In the sayde Towne I made myne abode till Thurseday then folowing but all that while colde I here no worde of Sir Thomas Wrothes being there nor that he bene sene in the saide Towne in xiiij dayes afore my comminge thither. The day afore my departure thence I understode of a practyse of certen that entended to do me some displesure. Who were the chief procurers therof I watt not but a frencheman that came with the Archehcretik of Geneva which frencheman was well acquaynted in sir Anthony Cookes [1] howse in Strawsebourg semed most diligent to procure that a Riter kneght and his men by all likelyhod redy for hyer to do any mischief sholde haue rydde me oute of the way for making reporte of my former service so muche was it stromaked [2] that I had done in those parties. And albeit I soughte diuerse wayes howe to have bene rydde of the Ryters company yet colde I not be shefted thereof. Whether I wente by water or lande his purpose was still towardes me for on a Thurseday whiles I was there perceaving my departure by the Postes towardes Spyres he sent his man on the way afore and I being afterwardes skarsely ij flightes shote from the Towne tho I rydde so faste as my poste horsses wolde suffre me yet dyd the Ryter easely passe afore me as he that rode of a very good horse with ij dagges at his saddle bowe and ij others behinde hym. When I sawe that and consydered all the cyrcumstaunces afore leste I myghte seme rather desperat then diligent in my busynes I torned back agayne to the saide Strawseburge

churche as to others' (*A Brief Discourse*, p. clxxxv). He took the chief part in the Geneva version of the Bible (*Life of Archbishop Parker*, p. 412). He was father of the celebrated Sir Thomas Bodley.

[1] Sir Anthony Cooke (1504–76), tutor to King Edward VI. He fled to Strasburg in 1554. He was the father of the celebrated five learned ladies. He returned home after Elizabeth's accession, and sat for Essex in the House of Commons (see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*).

[2] *Sic.*

with my guyde that doubted no lesse than I doubted the perill that mighte haue happenyd to me upon the waye. I obteyned easely safecondyte of the lordes of the saide Towne and departing the same daye from thence the next day folowing I arryved safely at Spyres. Duringe the tyme of myne abode at Strawesbourge I colde not set eye of two englisshemen together till the morning of my departure then mighte I see foure in a company watching by all likelyhode whether I went by water or lande. Those spoke to the Ryter and saluted hym as he rode out of the Towne gates to folowe me. One of them as my Guyde tolde me was Maister Cookes sonne[1] an other I toke to be his servaunte for after my retorne into the Towne I sawe hym goe into Master Cookes house. Oute of the same house I met with one callid Becon[2] excepte I be greatly disceaved. He amongest other thinges had tolde me I mighte perhapps repent myne enterprise, and that he wolde not haue bene in my cote for a Thowsand poundes to haue commed to deliver any letteres in those parties. Passing by Wesell I harde that Maister Whetnall was with the saide Duches of Suffolk and the same confyrmed to me agayne at Franckforde. Maister Isac was departed from Franckforde by water towardes the lowe Countreis in company of those that came to the said Frankford with Mistris Wilkinson three or iiij dayes afore my commynge thither. Of Mr. Meyres I colde none other newes but that he was mette after Witsonday betwene Strawsebourghe and Basell. At my being at Basell I coulde learne no tydinges of hym. This is all that I dyd or coulde dooe in the xecucion of my sayde chardge and commission and therof my bounden duty is to certify your lordeshipp by thies presentes signed and seald with my hand and Seale the xviijth day of October in the yeare of the raignes of our soueraygn lorde and lady the king and quenes Maiestyes Thirde and 1556
Fourthe.

[1] Sir A. Cooke had four sons, Anthony, Richard, Edward, and William (*ibid.*).

[2] Becon, Thomas, D.D. (1512-67), a refugee at Strasburg from 1554-58 (see *ibid.*).

THE CONFERENCE OF PILLNITZ

By OSCAR BROWNING, M.A., V.P. R.Hist.S.

Read December 17, 1896

The conference of Pillnitz, although it occupies an important place in all histories of the French Revolution, is still the subject of much misconception amongst historians. Immediately after it was held, a person so well informed as Mr. Burges, the English Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, believed that it resulted in a kind of treaty between Austria and Prussia for the dismemberment of France, and it was long regarded as the beginning of the first Coalition.

Sybel, in his 'History of the French Revolution,' has shown the inaccuracy of this view. He states that the Comte d'Artois laid before the Emperor and the King a document of ten articles, involving a scheme of inexorable war. It pointed to the restoration of the émigrés with the Comte de Provence at their head, and the practical deposition of Louis XVI. These articles may be found at full length in Vivenot and Hermann. The two monarchs rejected this scheme with scorn, sent to D'Artois on August 27 a joint declaration in which they said that they would invite a co-operation of all the powers of Europe to restore order in France, and if that were forthcoming would intervene actively on their own part. Sybel adds that, as it was well known that England would take no part in such intervention, the declaration was really in favour of doing nothing, and was merely intended to intimidate the Paris democrats. Ranke goes still further; and shows that the last clause of the declaration was inserted at the instance of Calonne, who in vain attempted to extract a stronger expression of opinion from the allied monarchs.

I have recently discovered among the Auckland papers a series of letters from Morton Eden, then English minister at the Electoral Court of Dresden, written to his brother, Lord Auckland, at the Hague, which throw a new light both on the interview and on its results, and show that it was of less importance with regard to French affairs than historians have generally considered it to be. One object of the meeting was to obtain the guarantee of the Emperor and the King to the new constitution of Poland, previous to the Elector of Saxony accepting the crown of that country. The first mention of the meeting is in a letter of August 10, 1791. Eden says: 'I have reason to believe it is the Elector's wish to procure the guarantee of the two illustrious personages expected at Pillnitz on the 25th inst. previous to his entering into negotiations with the Poles. For this interview of his Imperial Majesty with the King of Prussia gives great uneasiness to the Polish and French ministry and their respective courts. The former is apprehensive that a new pretext will be found for a further partition. The latter thinks that the affairs of France are the chief object of this meeting.' Eden writes on August 14, 1791: 'His Imperial Majesty, who has been absent for some weeks past at his estate in Bohemia, returned hither unexpectedly on Thursday last, and the next day he had an audience of the Elector to present to his Highness a letter from the Emperor in which he informs his Electoral Highness of his intention to be at Pillnitz the evening of the 25th inst., accompanied by the Archduke Francis, and adds that he was in hopes of meeting there his Prussian Majesty, to whom he had written to apologise for his having accelerated the time of the meeting owing to the necessity of his being in Prague on the 28th. I believe that his Imperial Majesty has likewise intimated to the Elector his hopes of being able at this interview to lay the basis of an alliance for the purpose of insuring the general tranquillity of Europe, and of effectuating some interposition favourable to the French King and his family.' He writes on August 17, 1791: 'The Elector received on Saturday last (August 13), by express, a letter from his

Prussian Majesty to inform him that he will be in Pillnitz towards the end of the month, but, as his Electoral Highness told me when I presented Lord Elgin to him on Sunday, he neither mentioned who would accompany him nor the exact day of his arrival. The reviews in Silesia do not finish till the 27th; it will therefore be impossible for his Prussian Majesty to reach Pillnitz before the departure of the Emperor, which is fixed for the 28th, unless he intrusts them, which he has never yet done, to a general officer. Count Marcolini is expected here from Italy to-morrow.' Eden writes to his brother on August 21: 'The apprehensions that I expressed to you in my last are removed, for Wednesday evening (August 17) the Prussian minister received, by express, orders to inform the Elector that his Prussian Majesty, accompanied by the Prince Royal of Prussia, will arrive at Pillnitz on the 25th. We are naturally eagerly intent what may pass at this interview, but, from the jarring interests of the parties concerned, it appears more than probable that nothing will be brought to maturity, and it will be even difficult to lay a basis for further negotiations. Neither of them, we understand, is to be accompanied by any men of business. I have in different letters mentioned what we suppose here to be the objects of the interview. If I am wrong, I wish that you will set me right.' Three days later we are told of the arrival at Dresden of the Marquis de Bouillé, his son Comte Louis, and the Prince of Nassau Siegen. He continues: 'The express arrived here yesterday with a letter from the Comte d'Artois to M. d'Onis, the Spanish Chargé d'Affaires, inclosing one for the Elector, in which I understand his Royal Highness requests permission to be present at the meeting between the Emperor and the King of Prussia, having already concerted this interview with these two monarchs.' The King of Prussia is expected the next day, the Emperor that evening. As a fact, the Emperor Leopold II., accompanied by the Archduke Francis, arrived at Pillnitz between eleven and twelve on the morning of Thursday, August 25; the King and the Prince Royal of Prussia arrived there about

an hour later. The same evening the Comte d'Artois reached Dresden. The next morning his Royal Highness was invited to Pillnitz, where an apartment was provided for him. On Friday, the 26th, there was an opera, ball, and fireworks at Pillnitz to which the principal nobility and foreign ministers were invited. On the 27th, a masked ball was given to the public at the great opera house in Dresden, at which the illustrious visitors and the family of the Elector were present. These fêtes, Eden tells us, were ill suited to the splendour of the occasion. 'Early on Sunday morning, August 28, his Imperial Majesty and the Archduke set out for Prague. The Emperor was attended by Marshal Lacey and M. Spielmann; the King of Prussia by Prince Hohenlohe, M. de Bischoffswerder, now a major-general, and M. de Manstein. In the suit of the Comte d'Artois were M. de Calonne, M. d'Esterhazy, M. d'Escars, Baron de Rolle, and several young men of fashion.'

What had been arranged at this interview? Eden tells us that he has been confidently assured that at this meeting a basis has been laid for the future alliance between his Imperial Majesty and the King of Prussia, 'in which his Majesty (the King of England) will be invited to become a contracting party. Russia is also to be comprehended, and the particular purpose is to be the mutual guarantee of their respective possessions, and likewise, it is said, even a guarantee of the present form of government of each State. By this act also it is supposed that the present state of Poland and the present limits of the Turkish empire will be guaranteed. I have likewise been very confidently informed that no actual interference will take place in the affairs of France.' The reception of the Comte d'Artois by all these illustrious personages was evidently very cold, perhaps humiliating. 'In my last I mentioned that his Royal Highness had, in his letter to the Elector which announced his intention of coming to Dresden, assured him that he had already concerted an interview with the Emperor and the King of Prussia. When

the Elector mentioned this circumstance to his Imperial Majesty, he in very emphatic terms denied it.'

In a further letter of August 31 Morton Eden writes to his brother: 'I scrupled not in my letter of Sunday last to tell you that it was not likely that the interview of the Comte d'Artois with the Emperor and the King of Prussia would be productive of their actual interference in the affairs of France. The cold reception that he met with, the desponding language of M. de Bouillé, the common opinion here, and particularly the assurance which I received the preceding evening, authorised me to hazard that conjecture. I was, however, soon after the departure of the post, informed that the two sovereigns had promised his Royal Highness at a meeting held the preceding evening in the Emperor's department, and which lasted from eleven till one, when his Imperial Majesty set out for Prague, that they would make a declaration in favour of the French King, and even send him active assistance, if a proper concert could be established with the Powers bordering on France. This report appears to be true, and as the best proof of it I here annex an answer which I received to my inquiries on the subject: "L'opinion que je vous ai manifestée sur les suites de l'arrivée de M. le Cte. d'Artois étoit effectivement que je doutois que cette démarche eût l'effet désiré. Quoique tout ce qui s'est passé depuis ait été traité entre les deux souverains et ce Prince, il me paraît cependant qu'il en a obtenu des assurances plus positives d'une assistance efficace pour tirer le Roi son frère de sa situation actuelle; mais je crois aussi que ces assurances supposent un concert préalable entre les Puissances intéressées et des mesures combinées en conséquence de ce concert." Some of his Royal Highness's attendants were greatly elated with these assurances, but M. de Flachslander (whose name I omitted) appeared less sanguine. He observed, on Prince Nassau's boasting of the success of their negotiation, "Je serai fort aise d'en voir les effets; il n'est pas si facile de mettre tant de Puissances en mouvement." Many, indeed, think that these assurances were extorted by dint of impor-

tunity, and that they will not be of any real effect. Whilst the Comte d'Artois was with the Emperor and the King of Prussia the Elector and the Electoral family were for the most part of the time waiting in the garden to see his Imperial Majesty to his carriage, he having said when he withdrew after supper that he would return immediately.'

The last mention of the interview made in these letters is on September 7, 1791. 'It is supposed here, though I have not hitherto been able to ascertain the facts, that, at the late interview at Pillnitz, the Elector entered into a convention with the Emperor and the King of Prussia, by which they guaranteed their respective possessions, and engaged to support each other against any innovation that might be attempted by their subjects. With greater certainty I can add that these two monarchs have assured the Elector of their guarantee of the new constitution and present limits of Poland.'

The conclusion we may draw from these scattered notices is that the French émigrés expected much from the interview of the two sovereigns, but gained little. The Comte d'Artois wished to give the impression that the meeting was especially arranged by him to discuss the affairs of France, and that those affairs had been the principal subject of consideration. The first statement was emphatically denied, the second was probably equally without foundation. All we know is that the first formal propositions of the Comte d'Artois were rejected, and that after supper on Saturday evening the Emperor and King had a hurried interview with the Comte d'Artois which lasted two hours, but which the Emperor evidently supposed would not last nearly so long, and that at this interview the well-known declaration was signed. The paper committed the signatories to nothing. The Comte d'Artois made the most of this step, but the keener-sighted émigrés were aware how hollow it was. Bouillé said to Morton Eden: 'There is nothing to do here; I shall pass the winter either at Mayence or in England.' If Mr. Burges had read Eden's letters he could not have given the meeting so fictitious an importance.

GOREE: A LOST POSSESSION OF ENGLAND

By WALTER FREWEN LORD

Read March 18, 1897 [1]

In the year 1663 Captain, afterwards Vice-Admiral, Sir Robert Holmes, during a time of profound peace, attacked and captured the Dutch possessions on the West Coast of Africa. Sailing across the Atlantic, he reduced the Dutch settlement of New Amsterdam, and rechristened it, in honour of the Duke of York, New York. On his return to England he was denounced by the Dutch as a freebooter, and thrown into prison, but on the outbreak of hostilities was released and restored to his rank, in which he long gave his country the benefit of his eminent abilities.

Of these two losses—Goree and New Amsterdam—Goree was thought at the time to be the more serious. The news reached Holland in May 1664. Secret instructions to proceed for its recovery were immediately issued to the Dutch admiral in the Mediterranean, Michael de Ruyter. He sailed to Cadiz, and put in there for a pilot for the West Coast. Here he most inopportunely fell in with the English admiral, Sir John Lawson, who was very inquisitive as to the Dutchman's destination.

In the conversational fencing-match that ensued De Ruyter was at a disadvantage, for he really wanted to ask a question. But the question—whether he could get a pilot for the West Coast—would have precipitated a fleet action, in which he had no instructions to engage; so he had to rest content with concealing his instructions, and finally sailed

[1] This paper was published in the *Nineteenth Century* for May 1897.

without a pilot. Sir John crowded all sail for England, and reported that he had left De Ruyter sailing south-west, but had been unable to discover his destination. The British ambassador at The Hague was at once ordered to find out.

The British ambassador at The Hague was Sir George Downing, an official whose strong point was his secret service. His weak point was that he was given to bragging of his performances. He had been known to boast that he knew everything that passed at the Council of State, and that he could have the Grand Pensionary's pocket picked whenever he chose. On being instructed to find out De Ruyter's instructions, Downing was annoyed to find himself completely at sea. As the matter was marked 'Urgent,' he took the desperate resolve of asking De Witt point-blank where De Ruyter had gone, and thus laid himself open to a very fair rebuff. 'Personally,' said De Witt, 'I am not clothed with any capacity to communicate the admiral's instructions; and as for what goes on at the Council of State, I am sure your Excellency is quite as well informed as I am.'

The object of so much diplomatic perturbation and such extensive military preparations was the island—or, rather, the rock—of Goree, about two miles in circumference, and the centre of a considerable trade which was sometimes described as gold and sometimes as gum, but which was always and substantially slaves.

It had been acquired peacefully by the Dutch in the year 1617; but the first hostile attack of 1663 was the prelude to a century and a half of ceaseless conquest and reconquest. Being unapproachable from one side, and on the other side only by a beach, one half of which was hopelessly surf-beaten if there was any weather at all, Goree was a place of considerable strength, and could be held by about 150 men against a much larger force. Being, however, a mere rock, the extent to which it could be fortified was strictly limited, so that a hostile expedition might exactly calculate whether it was worth while to attack, and the garrison could equally determine whether, in any case, bloodshed would be useless or not.

Nevertheless, several brisk encounters took place on the various occasions when the rock changed hands, and the opportunity for making a stout resistance was never fairer than when De Ruyter cast anchor before the island on October 22, 1664. For it happened that a week before eight vessels of the British West African Company, mounting 128 guns with 266 men, under convoy of a British man-of-war, had put in at Goree. But De Ruyter, who was a man of the most eminent capacity, diplomatic as well as naval, found means to divide the sea service from the land service, and deal with each separately. The details of this negotiation have been carefully preserved; they all hinged on the question of divided commands; and the end of it was that the garrison were allowed to depart to the British colony of Gambia with the honours of war, and the Dutch marched in. When once inside they admitted that if it had come to blows they would never have got in at all. However, the place was now once more Dutch, and remained in their hands unchallenged for a period of twelve years.

Goree was the principal loss endured by Holland in the course of the war that closed at the Peace of Nimeguen. It was captured by D'Estrées in the year 1677, and its possession was confirmed to France by the seventh article of the treaty signed on August 10 in the following year.

From this date the maritime supremacy of Holland began to wane, and as regards Goree she dropped out of the running, having held the post, with a single interruption, for exactly sixty years.

Thus 1678 found England in the colony of Gambia, and France watching her from the island of Goree. Fourteen years later, an enterprising governor of Gambia, James Booker, captured Goree, but he was unable to hold it against a superior force despatched from France six months later; and in 1693 Goree once more became French ground. This second French occupation lasted without interruption for sixty-six years, until the 'year of all the glories,' 1759. During this long period the French interests on the West Coast

were watched over by really able men. They were all of opinion that Goree was the key to the West Coast: not only because it was conveniently situated, but because it was a very healthy place. Consequently, when Pitt came into power Goree was marked out for capture. Commodore Keppel sailed from Kinsale on November 12, 1758, and made Goree on December 29, having lost one man-of-war castaway on the coast of Barbary on November 29, when 130 men were drowned. This was the most substantial loss sustained by the expedition, for though the French made a good show of resistance, the English expedition was too powerful for them, and we captured the place with 300 French prisoners and the usual stores and ordnance.

This, the third English occupation, lasted five years, and Goree was handed back to the French by the Treaty of Paris in 1763. We retained Senegal, on which transaction Lord Chesterfield makes this comment: 'Goree is worth four times as much as Senegal.' From this date onwards we have to consider the mainland politics a little. The ancient British colony was Gambia, with its capital at Bathurst; the ancient French colony was Senegal, with its capital at St. Louis. Goree lies between the two. Obviously Goree is the key of the situation. To leave the French Goree was to give them a standing invitation to return to the mainland, an invitation of which they soon availed themselves. However, the British Ministry was fired with the idea of amalgamating the newly won French province of Senegal on the mainland with the ancient English province, and making one large West African State, which they imagined would be strong enough to make the possession of Goree a matter of secondary importance. This policy was symbolised by the word Senegambia, which first saw the light in an Order in Council dated November 1, 1765, settling among other details the salary of the governor of the new province at 1,200*l.* a year. Senegambia was originally written Sene-Gambia, and is, of course, a compound of Senegal, the former French river, and Gambia, the English river.

Colonel Worge, governor of Senegal after its capture in 1757, had written to Pitt on January 11, 1762: 'The island of Goree is so situated that I should imagine it cannot possibly be of any use to the English nation,' a most extraordinary view, certainly. But this strong opinion from a local man gave great strength to the complaints of the African merchants against the French on the mainland. The city was all in favour of a large province on the mainland, and of letting Goree alone. The merchants thought that, by getting rid of the French as neighbours, they would avoid all embarrassments. They did not see that the French were just as much their neighbours at Goree as on the Senegal, and infinitely better placed for plaguing us on the mainland if they wished to do so.

Of course, the inevitable commenced immediately. Goree was a trading basis with the mainland; to store their goods the French required factories on the mainland; the factories must be guarded against depredations by the natives, and they rapidly took on the appearance of forts. Naturally, French forts flew the French flag; equally naturally, the men under the Union Jack resented such a neighbour. They called the French poachers; the French retaliated by calling us pirates. This was a miserable state of things, but it was made much worse than need have been by the appointment of incapable and rather inferior men to the new settlement.

When we remember what life on that coast is even now, with telegraphic communication with Europe, frequent mails, high pay regularly touched, and abundant leave to Europe, we can form some notion of what life must have been in those days of complete isolation. Existence must have been appallingly sombre. It does not require a double dose of original sin to explain occasional lapses from rectitude in such a situation. Rather it would require a double dose of virtue to keep men even moderately straight; and the officers there, almost without an exception, were quarrelsome, corrupt, and cruel.

St. Louis was the capital of the new British province,

Fort James (named after the Duke of York) having sunk to the position of a provincial capital. It is at Fort James that we first hear the name of Wall, who was governor there in the year 1777. This officer is remarkable in history as being, so far as I am aware, the only governor of a British colony hanged for murder. Wall's latest crime was perpetrated in the year 1782; but although he was in hot water throughout his official career, it is only fair to recall that in his first brush with his superiors he was in the right. We need not enter into the sordid details of that squabble further than to note that the new governor of Senegambia simply reported to the Secretary of State, on taking over his office, that he found 'a very complicated state of public fraud, embezzlement, and perjury.'

When one remembers the scanty pay, often withheld, the pestiferous climate, and the complete isolation from Europe, one is hardly surprised to hear that in January 1779 a mutiny broke out in the garrison of St. Louis. The garrison had been dying at the rate of one man every other day, and was reduced to a total force of twenty-one privates and one officer, who could not leave his bed.

Across this murky arena of miasma and crime and disease, there rings like the fanfare of a herald the resounding name of Louis-Armand Gontaut de Biron, Duc de Lauzun. According to French authorities, this nobleman wrought wonders on the coast. As governor of Goree he put the place in fine order; he swept down on the extensive British province of Senegambia, reduced it after an obstinate resistance, and put Fort St. Louis in so good a state of defence that it resisted for forty-eight hours and finally beat off the attacking squadron of Admiral Hughes. No doubt it gives an author, writing under the Republic, an additional pleasure to recount how, under the bad old days of the Monarchy, this gallant soldier was coldly received at Versailles and obtained no reward for his considerable services.

We are to remember that Hughes, with the same squadron, held his own in the East Indies in five fleet actions with

Suffren, the greatest admiral of France. The defences of Senegal must indeed have been metamorphosed to beat him off in forty-eight hours. We are also to remember that the obstinate resistance of the English to Lauzun himself could only have been offered by one officer, who was ill in bed, and twenty-one sickly and mutinous privates. In point of fact, the fort fired one shot from a thirty-two pounder and then hauled down the flag. The garrison were conveyed to France, and landed at La Rochelle.

The English official accounts of these events state that Admiral Hughes convoyed Lord Macleod and two companies of the 73rd Highlanders to Goree, which place they made on May 8, 1779. They found the place in ruins and defenceless, it having been shortly before evacuated by the French. It was quietly reoccupied by the English, who held it until its restoration to France at the Treaty of Versailles in 1783. As regards Senegal the records are somewhat confused, but it appears that the French blew up the fortifications with mines. During the fourth English occupation of Goree the French reoccupied Senegal in force, and made one unsuccessful attempt to recover Goree. Hughes proceeded to India, where he was to fight his famous naval duel with the fleet of Suffren.

Lord Macleod appointed a governor of the island, Adams. In doing this he was acting under his commission and was within his rights. Lord George Germain, the Secretary of State, did not, however, confirm the appointment; and he despatched Wall with a commission as governor of Goree, without revoking Adams's commission or even informing him of what he had done.

This appears to be officially irregular and personally discourteous. But this curious situation resulted that on July 8, 1780, there was anchored in Goree harbour a ship bearing Wall, holding a valid commission from the Crown, while in the fort on shore was Adams in precisely the same position. We need not go through the hostile correspondence that ensued: it is easy enough to imagine. On the one side

a demand to land and take possession, on the other a flat refusal. Then followed an intimation from Governor Wall that he would land and put Governor Adams in irons: to which Governor Adams rejoined that if Governor Wall attempted to do anything of the kind he would blow his ship out of the water. Finally, Wall sailed away for Senegal, which place he had been instructed to retake. After he had been some days at sea he raised the hulls of three vessels making north, and on running them down he captured Governor Adams, who was eloping with all the food, money, arms, and ammunition that he had been able to carry away from Goree.

Up to this moment Wall had behaved with propriety: from this time his conduct was that of a maniac. He carried Adams back to Goree, and tried him by a court martial over which he himself presided, and where he also appeared as chief witness. But this trifling irregularity was nothing to what ensued. If Adams had chastised Goree with whips, Wall chastised it with scorpions. Adams, it is true, was a swindler, but then the entire garrison shared the plunder; he was a pirate with a pirate's crew—a sort of Captain Kidd in miniature. But Wall took all the men's pay, and handed over beads, cloth, and cheap looking-glasses instead, ordering the men to trade for their pay, and accompanying his orders with foul abuse and mis-handling. On the day before he left the island he ordered Benjamin Armstrong, a non-commissioned officer, to receive 800 lashes with a rope one inch in diameter, from which punishment Armstrong died. The punishment was administered by relays of blacks, who relieved each other when they were exhausted. The governor stood by and hounded them on in language which was duly sworn to twenty years after, when Wall was in the dock at the Old Bailey. The villain had the effrontery to return to England on the cession of Goree to France, and report himself to the Secretary of State; but on the details of his conduct becoming known he fled the country.

He remained abroad for nineteen years. In 1801 he

returned and gave himself up to justice. He was a man of decent birth and well connected by marriage. He had spent his years of exile at Pisa, Florence, Rome, and Paris, and appears to have flattered himself that after a lapse of nineteen years the witnesses to his murderous atrocities would probably be dead. He was tried by Special Commission at the Old Bailey on January 20, 1802. The Lord Chief Baron, Sir Archibald Macdonald, presided, with Mr. Justice Laurence of the King's Bench, and Mr. Justice Rorke of the Common Pleas. Abbott, afterwards Lord Chief Justice, held the junior brief for the Crown; the Attorney-General, afterwards Lord Ellenborough, led him. The case was perfectly clear, the two chief points of the defence being, first, that there was a mutiny impending, which was not proven; and, secondly, that Armstrong was sentenced after a fair trial. The trial, however, was reduced to this: that Wall called out Armstrong on parade, told him that he was a mutinous fellow, and asked him what he had to say for himself; and on Armstrong replying what he had previously alleged, viz. that he preferred his pay in cash rather than in glass beads, the lashes were laid on.

It is a strange and repulsive story, this life on the West Coast a century ago; and Wall's crime is the most horrible incident of the story. As a rule, crimes of violence were not frequent; irregularities ran mostly on the lines of extravagant swindling of Government and revolting intoxication. But Wall was exceptional in every way. Socially he was rather above the average of men appointed to the West Coast; personally he was a good soldier, and had shown most distinguished courage at the siege of Havana. During his exile, whether because he was removed from the temptations of authority or for whatever reason, he showed himself an agreeable and more than an agreeable man. At the trial his witnesses to character testified that he was 'a man of distinguished humanity, a good husband and father.' Another witness said: 'I never knew a man of more benign disposition in my life, a gentleman brimful of the nicest feelings of philanthropy.' It

may have been so, but he was convicted of the capital crime and hanged on January 28, 1802.

The nineteen years of Wall's exile nearly corresponded with the French occupation of Goree, from 1783 to 1800. In the latter year Sir Charles Hamilton retook the island. He simply appeared before the place, which, after a verbal summons, capitulated with the honours of war. It is to be noted that there is no more talk of Goree being useless to England, after the fashion of Colonel Worge. Sir Charles Hamilton assumes, as a matter of course, that 'my Lords' will appreciate the strength and importance of his conquest. 'Goree by its natural situation is a thorn in our side;' 'the only way to serve this colony is to take Goree immediately;' these are the views of the contemporary governor of Senegambia. Colonel Fraser, the new governor of Goree, held similar views about Senegal. 'Senegal is a thorn in the side of Goree,' he wrote to Henry Dundas on January 5, 1801. He had just been repulsed with a loss of eleven killed and eighteen wounded in an attempt to capture Senegal, so he wrote with more than customary bitterness.

Thus the balance of opinion, official and commercial, had by this time settled down to this view—that whatever was settled on the mainland, Goree ought to be held along with the mainland colony. This conclusion was arrived at after an experience of a century and a half, during which time we had held Goree by itself, Gambia by itself, Goree and Gambia, Goree and Senegambia.

We have now reached the most critical moment of this century. Napoleon had made his famous dash on the East and had failed; he was now pushing on swiftly, and as secretly as might be, his preparations for the conquest of England by sea or land. The Treaty of Amiens had been signed in March 1802. It gave Napoleon time, and he never intended that it should serve any other end. He felt himself gradually falling into the grip of the great Sea Power; and the struggle of the Titan to set himself free raised the billows the distant ripples of which were felt even on the rock of

Goree. Everything turned on Malta. England, nervously anxious for peace, welcomed even the designedly cumbrous provisions of the Treaty of Amiens relating to that island, and honestly endeavoured to carry them out. Still clinging to the hope that France would preserve the peace, our Ministers nevertheless grew every day more anxious and perturbed. We can trace this painful tension even in the home correspondence with the little island of Goree. On June 30, 1802, Henry Dundas directed Colonel Fraser to evacuate the island, in accordance with the Treaty of Amiens, and take his troops to Sierra Leone. On October 26, 1802, Lord Hobart, Mr. Dundas's successor, in a despatch marked 'Most secret,' revokes the last order, and commands Fraser to hold on; already the Cabinet is growing uneasy. On November 15, 1802, in a secret despatch which shows signs of reassurance, Lord Hobart once more enjoins the evacuation of Goree. Ten days earlier the French had invited Fraser to retire. He had at once consented, but alleged the sound excuse that he had no transports. It does not appear that this was a subterfuge, and the French were quite polite and even contented with the situation. But although the evacuation was demanded by the French on November 5, 1802, Fraser was still in command a year later, and receiving Hobart's orders to put in hand the conquest of Senegal forthwith. Apparently the French had made no move. This is the more remarkable in that Sebastiani's famous Report had been published in January 1803, and by May, Lord Whitworth had already left Paris. Nevertheless, the year closed at Goree in profound peace.

The blow, when it fell, came from an unexpected quarter—from French Guiana. Louis the Sixteenth had accorded to the Royal Company of Guiana the exclusive privilege of trafficking in slaves with Goree. Hence there were in Cayenne numbers of desperate men already familiar with the cross-Atlantic voyage, partly ruined by the presence of the English on the West Coast, and perfectly acquainted with the island

of Goree and—most important of all—with its geography. The French authorities call these men corsairs: we need not be more particular. It was, in any case, a private undertaking and not a Government expedition.

The garrison of Goree, who soon had to resist the assault of these daring slavers, is thus described by their commandant:

'They were the sweepings of every parade in England; for when a man was sentenced to be flogged he was offered the alternative of volunteering for the Royal Africans, and he generally came to me.'

Those who were not recruited in this way were deserters from continental armies or from other English corps. 'They were not a bad set of fellows when there was anything to be done, but with nothing to do they were devils incarnate.'

We must not confuse the commandant with the ruffians his predecessors. Sir John Fraser was a remarkable man, honest and courageous; he had been twice wounded, one wound costing him a leg, and was soon in the thick of the hardest fighting ever seen at Goree.

The attacking force consisted of 600 men, including some soldiers of the regular army picked up at Senegal, and was led by an officer of the French Navy, Chevalier Mahé. The fleet that conveyed them carried sixty guns. Fraser's garrison numbered fifty-four men, all told, including the sick. This considerable disparity of forces becomes yet more formidable when we remember that the great strength of Goree was that, unless the attacking party were familiar with the geography of the island, there was only one place where they could land, and that place was covered by the guns of the fort. There was a possibility of landing on another part of the beach, but only if the attacking party knew exactly where to take the beach in the boats and so avoid the surf.

Fraser was deprived of this advantage, because the Guiana men knew the beach of Goree better than he did himself. He was therefore compelled to divide his diminutive army into two

detachments. But, like all remarkable commanders, he had materially increased his scanty strength by the enthusiasm he had inspired in all around him—not only in his soldiers, but also in the civilian population of the island. When all is said, the enemy numbered rather more than four to one, for they landed 240 men from their ships on January 18, 1804.

We have seen what Fraser's men were like: they were 'devils incarnate,' and like devils incarnate they fought. For twenty-four hours the battle raged all over the island. The main guard was captured and recaptured, and Fraser did not surrender until he had only twenty-five men left who could bear arms. But though seventy-five of the French had fallen —or half as many again as the entire force of the garrison— the French could afford their losses, and remained in a preponderance of seven to one, without counting the 360 men still on board the ships. Surrender was no dishonour under these circumstances; so the British flag was hauled down, and for the fifth time in 127 years Goree passed over to the French. The remainder of the English garrison was despatched to Senegal, and thence to England.

But this French occupation lasted a very short time. Although won at so great expense it only endured for six weeks. Moreover, it seems to have been held with some timidity; for English colours were kept flying, and sentinels clothed in red paced the walls of the fort in order to mislead any passing British squadron. They did not mislead Captain Dickson, who appeared before the place on March 7, 1804. Two days later, after a slight brush with the enemy and the exchange of some communications by letter, the English entered Goree, and commenced an occupation which, though their last, was destined to be their longest, for it endured till the conclusion of peace in 1814. The island, however, was not actually handed over to the French until the year 1817, exactly 200 years after its first occupation by the Dutch.

Although we had been capturing and restoring Goree at

intervals ever since the year 1663, the total period of our occupation did not exceed twenty-eight years. The record of the various occupations runs as follows :

1617–1663 Dutch	1763–1779 French
1663–1664 English	1779–1783 English
1664–1677 Dutch	1783–1800 French
1677–1692 French	1800–1804 English
1692–1693 English	1804 French
1693–1758 French	1804–1817 English
1758–1763 English	1817–1897 French

INDEX

ADAMS, C. KENDALL, 22
— Governor of Goree, 145, 146
Ade, John, 119
Anstruther, James Melville, minister of, 47
Aquinas, St. Thomas, works of, 90, 100
Aranda, Don Martin de, 55
Archivists, plan for training, 37–40
Armada, some survivors of the, 41–46
Auckland, Lord, papers of, 134
Austria, Francis, Archduke of, 134
Aybar, Captain Geronimo de Aybar, 50, 51

BACON, ELIZ., 115
Ballyshannon, 54, 61, 64
Bark of Hamburg, the hulk, 43, 48
Barlow, William, 125
Barteue (Bertie), Richard, 114–128
Basle, 131
— Council of, 92
Bathurst, capital of Gambia, 142
Becon, Thomas, 131
Belaugh (Co. Norfolk), 69, 73
Bert Castle, 52
Bertie, Peregrine, 115
Bertondona, Captain, 42
Bibliography of English History, poverty of, 19
— — — scheme for a, 20, 21, 27–30
Bigbury Bay (Devon), 41
Bingham, Sir R., 53, 54, 63
Bischoffswerder, M. de, 136
Blois, 48
Bodleigh, John, 129
Booker, James, 141
Borja, Francisco de, 48
Bouillé, Marquis de, 135, 137, 138
Brett, John, 114
British Museum, Principal Librarian of the, 40
Broad Haven (Co. Mayo), 63
Browning, Oscar, Mr., 133
Brumstead, 79
Brunet, M. J. C., 22
Burges, Mr., 133
Burke, William, 55

CADIZ, 139
Cadore, Duc de, 31
Calonne, M. de, 133, 136
Cambridge, King's College, muniments of, 68, 69
— — — tenants of, 83, 84
Carrig na Cowly, 65
Castillo Negro, the hulk, 43, 44
Chambers, Richard, 119
Chaplain General, Spanish, in the Armada, 51
Cheke, Sir John, 115
Chevalier, M. Ulysse, work of, 23
Church, political theories of the, 91
— theory of the government of the, 101
Cole, Mr. A. C., manuscripts of, 69
Coltishall (Co. Norfolk), 69, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 85, 87
— Green Gate Mere in, 74
— tenants of, 77
Concepcion, Spanish ships so named,
Connaught, South, 54
— Spaniards in, 54, 61, 63

Cooke, Sir Anthony, 130
— — — sons of, 130
Corbett, Mr. W. J., 67
Cordoba, Don Luis de, 54
— — — nephew of, 54
Corunna, Armada leaves, 41
Coton (Co. Camb.), 69, 70, 72, 75, 81, 82, 85
Cream, isle of, 45
Crostwick (Co. Norfolk), 69, 82
Cuellar, Captain Francisco, narrative of, 55, 65

Dahlmann and Waitz, bibliography by, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29
D'Artois, Comte de, 133, 135–138
Davenport, Miss Frances G., 68, 71
Delisle, M. Leopold, 33
Denny, Sir Edward, 65, 66
— Lady, 65
Derry, Bishop of, 62
Dickson, Captain, 151
Dingle Bay, 65
— Spanish ships wrecked in, 53
Diplomatic, study of, 35
'Divine Right of Kings,' doctrine of the, 97, 98, 99
Donegal, Spanish ships wrecked in, 53
— Spaniards in, 54, 61, 63, 64
Down, *or* Killaloe, Cornelius, Bishop of, 49
Downing, Sir George, 140
Doyle, Sir R., 115
Dresden, 134
Drogheda, 52
Dublin, Governor of, 52
Dundas, Henry, 149
Dungannon, 53
Dunluce, 52
— lord of, 51
Duquesa St. Ana, the hulk, 63
Duro, Captain Fernandez, 42, 43
Dutch Settlements, taken by the English, 139

Eccles-by-the-Sea (Co. Norfolk), 69
École de Chartes, 31–40
— — — programme of the, 31
École de Chartes, establishment of the, 31
— — — history of the, 31, 32
— — — regulations of the, 33
— — — objects of the, 33
— — — publications of the, 33, 34
— — — adopted in other countries, 35
— — — scheme for an English, 37, 38
Eden, Morton, 134, 137, 138
Edinburgh, 48
Elgin, Lord, 135
Elizabethan Village Surveys, 67–88
English Manuscripts and Records, 36
Enriquez, Don Diego, 55, 56
Escars, M. d', 136
Esterhazy, M. d', 136

Fair Isle, 46, 48
Falcon Blanco Mediano, the ship, 54
Fatio, M. Morel, 32
Fenton, Geoffrey, 64
Figgis, Rev. J. Neville, 89
Fitzwilliam, Lord Deputy of Ireland, 41, 52, 53, 61, 62, 63
Flachslander, M. de, 137
Forncett, manor of, 68
Fort James (Senegambia), 144
Frankfort, 119, 131
— Consul or Burgomaster of, 120, 121
— English refugees at, 120
— Protestant congregation of, 120
Fraser, Sir John, 149, 150, 151
Frettenham (Co. Norfolk), 69
Furlong, uses of the, in village surveys, 71, 82, 83
Fyneux, William, 116, 129

Gallicanism under Louis XIV., 92
Galway Bay, Spanish ships wrecked in, 53
Gambia, British colony of, 141, 142
Gerando, M. de, 31
Germany, a narrative of the pursuit of English refugees in, 113–132
Girona, the galleass, 59, 63, 65
Glangavenny Bay, 49

Goodolphyn, 129
Goree, a lost possession of England, 139-152
— captured from the Dutch, 139
— strength of its position, 140-142
— re-captured by the Dutch, 141
— captured by the French, 141
— re-captured by the English, 142, 145, 148, 151
— ceded to France, 142, 145, 151
— ceded by the treaty of Amiens, 148, 149
— evacuation of, countermanded, 149
— captured by French adventurers, 149, 150, 151
— synopsis of the successive occupations of, 152
Gosling, a merchant of London, 125
Gran Grifon, adventures of the, 43-48
— *Grin*, fate of the, 53
Grant Duff, Sir Mountstuart E., 1
Great Hautbois (Co. Norfolk), 69
Guzman, Juan de, 51

Hadiscoe (Co. Norfolk), 69
Hales, Christopher, 120
— John, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121
Hall, Mr. H., 35
Happisburgh (Co. Norfolk), 69, 79
Hardy, Sir T. Duffus, 27
Harrison, Mr. Frederic, 19
Hauréau, M., 33
Heath, Nicholas, Lord Chancellor, 114
Hebrides, 51
— Spanish ships lost on the, 41
Heidelberg, 128, 129
Hempstead (Co. Norfolk), 69, 70, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 87
— — — Green Gate Mere in, 74
— — — tenants of, 76
Historical Bibliography, proposal for a new, 19-30
Hobart, Lord, 149
Hohenlohe, Prince, 136
Holmes, Sir Robert, 139
Horstead (Co. Norfolk), 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87
— with Staninghall, tenants of, 76
Hovenden, English officers named, 49, 52, 64
Hughes, Admiral, 144, 145
Hume, Major Martin A. S., 41

Ingham (Co. Norfolk), 69, 79
Innishowen Head, 48
Isac, Edward, 116, 131

Jesuits, some political theories of the early, 89-112
— propaganda of the, 93, 94
— political theories of the, 95, 96
— — works of the, 99, 100
— position of the, 112
Jesus, Society of. *See* Jesuits
Juliana, the ship, 55

Kelly, Major John, 50, 64
Keppel, Commodore, 142
Killaloe, or Down, Cornelius, Bishop of, 49
— Castle of, 51
Killibegs, harbour of, 63

Lacey, Marshal, 136
Lamond Miss E., 116
Langlois, M. Ch. V., 22
Lasso, Don Rodrigo, 51, 52
Laughton, Professor J. K., 42
Lauzun, Duc de, 144
La Via, the ship, 63
Lawson, John, 139
Leadam, Mr. J. S., 113
Legorreta, Captain, 48
Lessingham (Co. Norfolk), 69, 70, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 87
— — — tenants of, 77
Lespine, L'Abbé, 31
Legoa, Don Alonso de, 62, 63, 64, 65
Loghros Bay (Co. Donegal), 63
Lord, Frewen, 139
Lough Erne, 64
— Foyle, 62

Luzon, Col., Don Alonso de, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53
— Don Diego de, 51

MACLEOD, Lord, 145
Madan, Mr. F., 35
Mahé, Chevalier, 150
Maitland, Professor, F. W., 39
Manglana, Castle of, 59
Manrique, Don Antonio, 51
— — Garcia, 48, 51
Manstein, M. de, 136
Marcolini, Count, 135
Mariana, work of, 108
Mas Latrie, M. de, 32, 33
Mason, Sir John, 115
Mc Donnell, Sorleyboy, 51, 52, 65
Mc Glannogh, the, 59, 60, 61
Mc Sweeny, the Irish chieftain, 54, 61, 63, 64
Medina, General Juan Gomez de, 43
— Sidonia, Duque of, 42
— — his cowardly flight, 43, 55
Melville, Andrew, 46
— James, 46
Melvin Lake, 59
Mendoza, Don Pedro de, 54
— Ambassador of Spain, 66
Meres (Meyres), Antony, 116, 131
Meyer, M. P., 33
Mullett headland, 63
Munster, Irish rebellion in, 65

NASSAU SIEGEN, PRINCE OF, 135, 137
Nevell, Sir Henry, 115, 129
New Amsterdam, captured from the Dutch, 139
New York, captured from the Dutch, 139
Nimeguen, peace of, 141
Norfolk, surveys of Elizabethan villages in, 67–88
Norris, Thomas, 65
Nova, Juan de, 48
Nuestra Señora de la Rose, the, 65

O'DOGHERTY, the, 49, 52, 53
— castles of, 49, 52
O'Donnell, the Irish chieftain, 54, 64
O'Kane, an Irish gentleman, 51
— Prince of Derry, 62
O'Malley Dowdragh, 54
O'Neil, Tirlogh Lenogh, 64
d'Onis, M., 135
Oquendo, Capt., 42
O'Rourke, the Irish chieftain, 54, 58, 64, 65
Orkneys, Spanish ships lost on the, 41, 43, 44, 48

PALÆOGRAPHY, study of, 35
Palsgrave, Otto Henricus, the, 122–128
— officers of, 122–128
Papacy, political doctrines of the, 91, 92, 93
Paris, Mons. G., 33
Paris, parliament of, 94
Parma, Duke of, 48
Parsons, Father, work by, 99
'Passive Obedience,' doctrine of, 106, 107
Pavillet, M., 31
Pillnitz, the conference of, 134–138
— misconceptions as to the, 133
— arrival of royal personages at, 135, 136
Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham, 142, 143
Political theories of early Jesuits, 89–112
Polybius, work of, incomplete, 1
— his style, 2
— his subject matter, 2
— as a moralist, 2
— influence of, on Cicero, 2
— — — on Machiavelli, 2
— — — on Montesquieu, 2
— on Plato, 3
— his views of a constitution, 3
— edition of, extracts from, 3
— Oxford lectures on, 3
— his curious modernness, 4
— his cosmopolitan views, 4

Polybius, his opinion of war, 4
— as an advocate of peace, 5
— his views on the making of modern history, 5–8
— his theory of climatic influences upon the national character, 7
— his estimate of geography, 7
— his views on political leadership, 8, 9
— on the duties of a commander, 9, 10
— on the value of personal evidence, 10
— his fatalism, 10
— his cosmopolitan views, 11
— on the uselessness of a hopeless existence, 11, 12
— on national warfare, 12, 13
— on the sites of Mediterranean cities, 14, 15
— his prescience, 15
— his impartiality, 16
— his views as to criticism, 16
Poole, Mr. R. L., 35
Potthast, August, 22
Powell, Prof. F. York, 31
Prague, 136, 137
Prussia, Frederick William III., king of, 134

Raleigh, Sir Walter, 66
Rata Coronada, the ship, 62, 63
Recalde, Capt., 42
— Admiral, 65
Records, deputy keeper of the, 39
— arrangement of local, 38
— training of archivists of, 35–40
Refugees, narrative of the pursuit of the, in Germany, 113–132
Rives, M., 32
Rolle, Baron de, 136
Rosière, M. Wallon de, 33
Ruislip (co. Middlesex) 69, 70, 71, 75, 81, 85
Ruyter, Michael de, 139, 140

St. Louis, capital of Senegal, 142, 143
— fort of, taken by the French, 144, 145
Salas, Jean de, work by, 100
Salto, Captain Beltram del, 50, 51
Salvandy, Comte de, 32
San Giuseppe, Colonel Sebastiano di, 66
San Juan, Spanish ship so named, 42, 48, 65
— *Juan Bautista*, the galleon, 55
— *Juan de Sicilia*, the, 55
— *Marcos*, the ship, 65
Saule, Arthur, 129
Saxony, elector of, 134
Scottow (co. Norfolk), 69
Sebastiani, Colonel, 149
Senegal, 142, 143
Senegambia, first called, 142
Servois, M., 33
Shannon, Spanish ships wrecked in the, 53
Silesia, 135
Simeon, M., 31
Sligo, 54, 55, 57, 58
— Bay, 55
— Castle, 64
Sonnenschein, W. S., 22
Spenser, Edmund, 66
Spielmann, M., 136
Spiers, 129–131
Stafford, Sir William, 116, 129
Staninghall (Co. Norfolk) 69, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87
State, theories of the, 89, 90
— theory of the government of the, 102–104
Strasburg, 130, 131
Suarez, work of the Jesuit, 99
Suffolk, Katherine, Duchess of, 114, 121, 131
Suffren, Admiral B. de, 145
Surveys of Elizabethan villages in Norfolk, 67–88
Sutton, Edmonde, 119, 120
Sybel, H. von, 133

Tedder, Mr. H. R., 22
Toft Monks (Co. Norfolk) 69, 71, 73, 75, 76, 81, 82, 85, 87
— — — tenants of, 77
— — — water mere at, 74

Topcliffe, Mr., 84
Tralee, Bay of, 65
Tremain, Nicholas, 129
— Richard, 129
Turpin, John, 125
Turpyn, Thomas, 125
Tyrannicide, condemnation of, 98
— justification of, 105
Tyrone Earl of, 53, 64

Valenzera, the ship, 43
— adventures of the, 48–53
Versailles, treaty of, 145
'Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos,' 93

WALL, governor of Goree, his government, 146
— — — his quarrel with governor Adams, 146
— — — his crime, 144, 146
— — — his trial, 147
Walsham, south, (Co. Norfolk) 71
Walsingham, secretary, 65
Weinheim, castle of, 121
— description of, 121, 122
— English refugees at, 122–127
— 'kelder' of, 123–128
Wesel, 121, 122, 131
Westphalia, treaty of, 92
West Wretham (co. Norfolk) 82
Whetnall, Roger, 116, 131
Whigs, parallel of the opinions of, with those of the Jesuits, 103, 109
Whittingham, William, 119
Whitworth, Lord, 149
Williams, William, 119
Wood, Thomas, 119, 120
— William, 119, 220
Worge, Colonel, 143
Wormes (Worms) 129
Wroth, Sir Thomas, 115
Wylkynson, Jane, 116, 118, 119, 131

ZAPATA, Don Sebastian, 51

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

Royal Historical Society,

115 St. Martin's Lane, W.C.

January 21, 1897.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

SESSION 1895-96.

THE Council of the Royal Historical Society present their Annual Report to the General Meeting of the Fellows.

The President delivered his Annual Address on February 20.

The following Papers were read and discussed at the Ordinary Meetings of the Society during the past Session. The year 1895 was the six hundredth anniversary of the holding of Parliaments in England, and reference was made to this great constitutional subject in three of the Papers included in the Card of the Session :—

'The First Parliament Roll.' By Hubert Hall, F.S.A.

'The Parliament of Lincoln.' By Arthur Hughes, B.A.

'Early Colonial Constitutions.' By J. P. Wallis.

'Shakespeare as an Historian.' By Henry Elliot Malden, M.A., Vice-President R. Hist. S.

'Early Christian Geography.' By C. Raymond Beazley, M.A.

'The Celtic Chroniclers of Britain.' By J. Foster Palmer, M.R.C.S., L.C.P.

'Richard the Redeless.' By S. D. Holton, B.A.

'The Foreign Policy of William Pitt in the First Decade of his Ministry in its European Significance.' By Dr. Felix Salamon, Privat-Dozent in the University of Berlin.

Most of the above papers have been printed in Volume X. of the New Series of the Society's *Transactions*.

The publication of Mr. Leadam's large and important edition of the text of the 'Inquisition of 1517,' which was in the press at the close of last Session, has been still further delayed by the discovery of fresh MSS. at the Public Record Office. It has now been passed for press, and will shortly be issued as a volume of nearly 700 pages, with an Introduction, Notes, Statistical Tables and Illustrative Documents, with the title of 'The Domesday of Inclosures.'

The publication of three further volumes that were in progress—namely, 'The Secret Service Expenditure of George III.,' 'The Merchants of the Staple at Calais,' and 'The Military Despatches relating to the Second Coalition against Napoleon'—has been deferred pending the conclusion of the arrangements proceeding with the Camden Society for the publication of works in progress for each Society prior to their amalgamation in May next. A provisional list was, however, circulated in November last announcing the titles of three volumes to be issued jointly by the two Societies at an early date, one of which, 'The Archpriest Controversy,' edited for the Camden Society by Mr. T. G. Law, has already appeared. It is expected that within the next three months a further list will be issued containing the titles of at least six more volumes.

The Librarian reports that 113 books and pamphlets have been added to the Library during the year ended October 31, 1896, bringing the number of the books in the Library up to 3,336. Of the additions, 19 volumes were acquired by purchase and the rest (69 volumes and 25 pamphlets) were presented.

The Council append to their Report a Prospectus of the Objects of the Society and other information.

They also append the Treasurer's statement of the financial position of the Society from November 1, 1895, to October 31, 1896.

Treasurer's Report, October 31, 1896.

The Treasurer presents the Balance Sheet for the year ending October 31, showing the gross receipts for the year as £533. 14*s.* 11*d.*, and the expenditure £420. 10*s.* 9*d.*, leaving a balance, including the amount brought forward from last year, of £308. 4*s.* 2*d.*

The Reserved Fund has been increased during the year by one life composition, dividends, and interest, amounting to £22. 11*s.* 7*d.*, leaving a balance invested and on deposit of £440. 4*s.* 4*d.*

There are in arrears one guinea subscription for 1893, one for 1894, three for 1895, and eleven for 1896; also one two-guinea subscription for 1893, two for 1894, eight for 1895, and thirty-two for 1896, amounting to £107. 2*s.* Of these the Council have remitted five subscriptions amounting to £10. 10*s.*

There are 179 Fellows paying two guineas, 126 paying one guinea, and 91 life and honorary, making a total of 396 Fellows at present in the Society.

R. Hovenden.

BALANCE SHEET

For the year ending October 31, 1896.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
To Balance brought forward				195	0	1
,, Subscriptions for year 1893	6	6	0			
,, ,, ,, 1894	16	16	0			
,, ,, ,, 1895	46	4	0			
,, ,, ,, 1896	419	0	0			
,, ,, ,, 1897	7	7	0			
				495	13	0
,, Sales of Publications				17	1	11
,, one Life Composition				21	0	0
				£728	15	0

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
By Printing				165	5	3
,, Transcribing and Translating				20	7	4
,, Stationery				5	8	8
,, Salaries				156	0	0
,, Postages, Carriage, and Petty Expenses				34	17	2
,, Societies' Subscriptions				9	16	0
,, Advertising				5	12	0
,, ⅔ of one Life Composition invested				14	0	0
,, Rent of Museum				6	14	0
,, Indexing				2	2	0
,, Cheque Book				0	8	4
				420	10	9
,, Balance at London and South-Western Bank				308	4	3
				£728	15	0

CAPITAL OR RESERVED FUND ACCOUNT.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
To Balance brought forward				417	12	9
,, Dividends				7	19	8
,, Interest on Deposit Account				0	11	11
,, ⅔ of one Life Composition				14	0	0
				£440	4	4

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
By £300 Stock, 2¾ % Consols				304	11	0
,, Deposit at London and South-Western Bank				135	6	1
,, Interest accrued on deposit				0	7	3
				£440	4	4

R. HOVENDEN, *Treasurer.*

We have examined the entries in the books with the vouchers from November 1, 1895, to October 31, 1896, and find them correct showing the receipts to have been £728. 15*s.* (including £195. 0*s.* 1*d.* brought forward), and the payments to have been £420. 10*s.* 9*d.*, leaving a balance of £308. 4*s.* 3*d.* in favour of the Society.

R. DUPPA LLOYD,
J. FOSTER PALMER,
R. E. STEVENS, } *Auditors.*

CHARTER OF INCORPORATION

CHARTER OF INCORPORATION

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Victoria, BY THE GRACE OF GOD, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, TO ALL TO WHOM these Presents shall come, Greeting;

WHEREAS Our right trusty and well beloved Councillor, Henry Austin, Baron Aberdare, Knight Grand Cross of Our most Honourable Order of the Bath, Fellow of the Royal Society, has by his Petition humbly represented unto Us, That in the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight, His Grace the Archbishop of York, the late Right Honourable John, Earl Russell, K.G., F.R.S., the late Very Reverend the Dean of Westminster, Sir John Lubbock, Baronet, the late Sir John Bowring, LL.D., Sir Roundell Palmer, Q.C., M.P., D.C.L., now Earl of Selborne, the late George Grote, Esquire, F.R.S., and others of Our subjects formed themselves into a Society known as the Historical Society of Great Britain, having for its object the promotion of the study of History;

AND WHEREAS We were pleased in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two to permit the said Society to adopt the name and title of the Royal Historical Society;

AND WHEREAS in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven We were pleased to become Patron of the said Royal Historical Society;

AND WHEREAS it has been represented to Us by the said Petitioner that the said Society has been and continues to be actively employed in promoting the object for which the said Society was founded, and has published thirteen volumes of Transactions containing original memoirs read before the Society, and did also in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six appoint a Com-

mittee for the due celebration of the eight hundredth anniversary of the completion of the Domesday Book of His late Majesty William the First, by which Committee meetings for the reading of papers and exhibitions of Domesday Book and other manuscripts were held, and the papers read at the meetings have been published under the title of Domesday Studies, of which We have been pleased to accept the dedication, and the said Society has also published the despatches from Paris in one thousand eight hundred and two–one thousand eight hundred and three of Lord Whitworth, Ambassador of His late Majesty King George III ;

AND WHEREAS the said Society has in aid of its objects collected a Library to which additions are constantly being made, and other property ;

AND WHEREAS the said Petitioner, believing that the well-being and usefulness of the said Society would be materially promoted by its obtaining a Charter of Incorporation, hath therefore, on behalf of himself and the other Fellows of the said Society, most humbly prayed that We would be pleased to grant to those who now are, or who shall from time to time become Fellows of the said Society, Our Royal Charter of Incorporation ;

NOW KNOW YE that We, being desirous of encouraging a design so laudable and salutary, of Our especial grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, have granted, directed and declared, and by these Presents do grant, direct, and declare that the said Henry Austin, Baron Aberdare, and such others of Our loving subjects as now are Fellows of the said Royal Historical Society (hereinafter called the said Society), or as shall hereafter from time to time become under the provisions of these Presents Members of the Body Politic and Corporate by these Presents created, shall for ever hereafter be one Body Politic and Corporate by the name of the ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY ; and for the purposes aforesaid, and by the name aforesaid, shall have perpetual succession and a Common Seal, with full power and authority to alter or vary, break and renew the same at their discretion, and by the same name to sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, answer and be answered in every Court of Us, Our Heirs and Successors.

AND Our will and pleasure is, that the Royal Historical Society hereby created (hereinafter called the Corporation) may, notwithstanding the Statutes of Mortmain, take, purchase, hold and enjoy

to them and their successors a hall or house, and such other lands, tenements, and hereditaments as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of the Society, Provided that the yearly value of such lands, tenements, and hereditaments (including the said hall or house) computed at the yearly value of the same at the time of the respective purchases or acquisition thereof do not exceed in the whole the sum of Two thousand pounds sterling.

AND Our will and pleasure is, and We do hereby declare, That there shall always be a Council of the Corporation, and that the said Council shall consist of a President, not less than six Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer, a Secretary, and not less than fourteen Councillors, who shall be elected and retire in accordance with the Bye-laws for the time being of the Corporation, and that the present Council of the said Society shall be the first Council of the Corporation;

AND Our will and pleasure is, That the Council of the Corporation may from time to time make, revoke, alter, and amend bye-laws for all or any of the following purposes, to wit:—

(*a*) Prescribing the manner in which persons may become members of the Corporation and the conditions of membership, and the rights, powers, duties, privileges, and amotion of the members of the Corporation;

(*b*) Prescribing the tenure of office by the President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer, Secretary, and Councillors of the Corporation (including those hereby appointed), and the mode of electing or appointing future Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Treasurers, Secretaries and Councillors, and the rights, powers, duties, privileges, and amotion of the first and future Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Treasurers, Secretaries, and Councillors;

(*c*) With respect to the appointments, emoluments, and tenure of office of the officers and servants of the Corporation;

(*d*) The election or appointment and amotion of honorary members or Fellows of the Corporation (who may, if the bye-laws so declare, be either Our subjects or foreigners, or both);

(*e*) The classes into which Members are to be admitted;

(*f*) Generally for regulating the affairs, property, business, and interests of the Corporation and its Council and Members, and making, revoking, altering, and amending bye-laws and carrying out the objects of these Presents;

Provided that such bye-laws shall not be valid unless and until they have been approved by a clear majority of the members of the Corporation present at a meeting specially summoned for the purpose, and Provided also that if any bye-law be contrary to the objects of the Corporation, or the intent or meaning of this Our Charter, or the laws or statutes of Our Realm, the same shall be absolutely null and void.

WE do further direct and declare that the existing bye-laws of the said Society shall (so far as they are applicable) apply to the Corporation, its Council, members, and affairs until bye-laws made under these Presents have come into force but no longer.

WE do further by these Presents declare that it is Our will and pleasure that these Presents may be repealed, altered, amended, or added to by any Charter granted by Us, Our Heirs and Successors, at any time hereafter, and accepted by a clear majority of the members of the Corporation present at a Meeting specially summoned for the purpose.

IN WITNESS whereof We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent. WITNESS Ourself at Westminster, the thirtieth day of July, in the fifty-third year of Our Reign.

By Warrant under the Queen's Sign Manual,

MUIR MACKENZIE. L.S.

BYE-LAWS

THE BYE-LAWS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

(Incorporated by Royal Charter).

I.—The Society shall consist of Ordinary, Corresponding, and Honorary Fellows. The number of Honorary Fellows shall not exceed Seventy-five; and of these not more than twenty-five shall be British subjects.

II.—The Council shall be chosen from the Ordinary Fellows, and shall consist of not less than twelve Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer, and not less than sixteen Fellows.

III.—The President shall be elected by the Fellows at the Anniversary Meeting, and shall hold office for a term of four years. The past Presidents shall be ex-officio Honorary Vice-Presidents of the Society.

IV.—The three Vice-Presidents senior on the roll, and the four Members of Council senior on the roll, shall retire annually, but shall be eligible for re-election.

V.—The names of Fellows to be submitted for election as Office-Bearers and Members of Council shall be proposed by the Council, and intimated to the Fellows at least Fifteen days before the Anniversary Meeting; but any ten Fellows of the Society may nominate

Fellows to supply vacancies, such names being notified to the Secretary at least Ten days before the said Meeting. If there should be more than three Candidates for the office of Vice-President, or more than four Candidates to fill the vacancies in the Council, the elections shall take place by ballot, as provided in Appendix II.

VI.—The Council shall determine the Works, Articles, and Papers to be read at the Society's Meetings, and otherwise shall arrange the business of the Society; and nothing shall be published in the name of the Society, or under its auspices, or inserted in the Society's *Transactions* or other publications, without the authority of the Council.

VII.—The Society shall distribute gratuitously to each Ordinary Fellow a copy of the *Transactions* as the volumes are issued, these to be forwarded free of expense to all Fellows residing within the postal union.

VIII.—Fellows shall have access to the Society's Library under such regulations as may appear to the Council necessary.

IX.—Every person desirous of admission into the Society as an Ordinary Fellow must be proposed and recommended agreeably to the Form No. I. in the Appendix hereto, and such recommendation must be subscribed by two Fellows at least, one of whom must certify his personal knowledge of such candidate. The certificate thus filled up shall be delivered to the Secretary, and shall be communicated by him to the Council at their next meeting, when the election of such candidate may take place.

X.—Fellows shall be elected by the Council on the vote of two-thirds of the Members of Council present. The names of those so elected shall be announced at the next Ordinary Meeting of Fellows.

XI.—The Secretary shall send to every elected Fellow notice of his election within seven days thereafter. No election of an Ordinary Fellow shall be complete, neither shall his name be printed in the list of the Society, nor shall he be entitled to exercise any of the privileges of a Fellow, until he shall have paid

his entrance fee and first year's contribution, or compounded for the same, as hereinafter provided; and unless these payments be made within three calendar months from the date of election, such election may be declared void by the Council.

XII.—Every Fellow of the Society shall furnish his Address, or that of his Agent or Banker, to the Secretary; and all notices or packets posted or sent to such address shall be held to be duly delivered.

XIII.—The Council shall be empowered to elect persons of distinction as Honorary Fellows, and also Corresponding Members, but these shall have no claim (unless on the usual annual payment) to receive the publications or vote at the Meetings of the Society. The Council shall also have power to elect in each year two persons eminent in historical studies, who shall have all the privileges of Life Fellows.

XIV.—If any Fellow of the Society or any Honorary Fellow shall so demean himself that it would be for the dishonour of the Society that he longer continue to be a Fellow thereof, the Council shall take the matter into consideration; and if the majority of the Members of the Council present at some meeting (of which and of the matter in hand such Fellow and every Member of the Council shall have due notice) shall decide by ballot to recommend that such Fellow be expelled from the Society, the Chairman shall at the next Ordinary Meeting announce to the Society the recommendation of the Council, and at the following Ordinary Meeting the question shall be decided by ballot, and if at least three-fourths of the number voting are in favour of the expulsion, the name of such Fellow shall forthwith be removed from the roll.

XV.—The Annual Subscription shall be Two Guineas, provided always that Fellows elected prior to the 1st of March, 1884, shall not be required to pay more than One Guinea annually, and Members of the Camden Society elected prior to the 1st March, 1895, the sum of One Pound annually. The entrance fee shall be fixed from time to time by the Council.

XVI.—Fellows of the Society may at any time compound for their annual subscription by the single payment of Twenty Guineas,

of which Fourteen Pounds Sterling shall be placed to the Capital Account of the Society.

XVII.—No Fellow shall be entitled to exercise any of the privileges of the Society unless and until his subscriptions for the current and previous years have been paid.

XVIII.—All Annual Subscriptions, except the first, shall be due and payable on the 1st January, and any Fellow of the Society who shall fail to pay his subscription on or before the 1st of June shall be applied to in writing by the Secretary; and if the same be not paid on or before the 31st October following, the Council shall be empowered to remove his name from the roll, but such Fellows shall continue liable to the Society for the arrears of their subscriptions.

XIX.—The Meetings of the Society are of three kinds—Anniversary, Special, and Ordinary.

XX.—The Anniversary Meeting shall be held on the Third Thursday of February, or at such other time as the Council shall from time to time appoint. At the Anniversary Meeting the vacancies in the Council shall be filled up.

XXI.—The Council may at any time call a Special Meeting of the Society whenever it shall be considered necessary, and shall convene a Special Meeting of the Society on a requisition to that effect being made by twenty Fellows, the date of such Meeting being fixed within one month from the receipt of the requisition.

XXII.—A fortnight's notice, at least, of the time when, and the object for which, every Special Meeting is to be holden shall be sent to every Fellow residing in the United Kingdom; and no other business than that of which notice has been thus given shall be entered upon or discussed at such Meeting.

XXIII.—At every Special Meeting of the Society ten Fellows shall form a quorum.

XXIV.—The Ordinary Meetings shall be held on the third Thursday of each month, from November to June inclusive in each year, or at such other times as the Council shall determine.

XXV.—At the Ordinary Meetings papers and communications shall be read and discussed; but nothing relating to the regulations or management of the Society shall be brought forward.

XXVI.—Visitors to the Ordinary Meetings may be admitted, if introduced personally by Fellows, or by their written order, under such regulations as the Council may determine.

XXVII.—In all Meetings of the Council five shall be a quorum, and all questions shall be decided by show of hands, unless a ballot be demanded.

XXVIII.—The Accounts of the Society shall be from time to time examined by the Council, who shall present, and cause to be read to the Anniversary Meeting a complete statement thereof, together with a report on the general affairs of the Society during the preceding year.

XXIX.—The Council shall appoint any persons they deem fit to be salaried officers or clerks, for carrying on the necessary concerns of the Society; and shall define the duties to be performed by them respectively, and shall allow to them respectively such salaries, gratuities, and privileges as the Council may deem proper; and may suspend or discharge any officer or clerk from office whenever there shall seem to them occasion for so doing.

XXX.—The Council shall elect their own Chairman and Vice-Chairman to preside over their Meetings, and in the absence of both any Member of Council present may be elected to preside.

XXXI.—In all Meetings of the Society and Council, except in the cases otherwise provided for, the decision of a majority of the Fellows voting shall be considered as the decision of the Meeting, the President or Chairman having a casting vote only.

XXXII.—The Treasurer shall receive all moneys due to the Society, and on the order of the Council pay out of the moneys so received all charges on the Society's funds ; he shall keep a proper account of his receipts and payments. All cheques or orders on the Treasurer or his banker for the payment of any sum of money above £2 shall be signed at a Meeting of the Council by three Members thereof, or by two Members with the counter signature of the Secretary for the time being.

XXXIII.—At the last Ordinary Meeting in each session, the Fellows shall choose two Auditors, not of the Council, who, with one Auditor appointed by the Council, shall audit the Treasurer's accounts, and report thereon to the Society, which report shall be presented to the Anniversary Meeting.

XXXIV.—On a vacancy occurring in the office of President or other office of the Society, or in the Council, the Council shall have power to supply such vacancy until the following Anniversary Meeting.

XXXV.—Any Fellow of the Society who proposes to read a Paper at any Ordinary Meeting shall submit it for the approval of the Council, and shall state in writing whether such Paper has, in whole or in part, been previously read to any other Society, or publicly utilised in any form ; but it shall rest with the Council to determine whether a Paper shall be read or utilised by the Society.

APPENDIX

No. I.

FORM OF A CANDIDATE'S CERTIFICATE.

Certificate of Candidate for Election.

Name, ...

Title, Profession, or Occupation, ...

Residence, ...

being desirous of admission into the ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY, we the undersigned recommend him as a fit and proper person to be admitted as a Fellow.

Dated this .....day of.....189.....

.....*F.R. Hist. Soc.* { *From personal knowledge.*

.....*F.R. Hist. Soc.* } *From general knowledge.*

.....*F.R. Hist. Soc.* }

Proposed.....189 .....

Elected.....189.....

No. II.

A VOTE by ballot, when necessary, shall be conducted in the usual manner, and the Secretary shall cause Voting Papers to be prepared for that purpose in the following form :—

VOTING PAPER.

Election held ..... **18**.....

Candidates for the office of President:	1.	.....
	2.	.....
Vice-President:	1.	.....
	2.	.....
	3.	.....
For the Council:	**Retiring Members who offer themselves for re-election:**	
	1.	.....
	2.	.....
	3.	.....
	4.	.....
	Candidates nominated under Rule V.:	
	5.	.....
	6.	.....
	7.	.....
	8.	.....

Fellows shall record their votes by putting a cross against the names of the Candidates in whose favour they wish to vote. If any Fellow shall record his vote for more Candidates than there are vacancies, his Voting Paper shall be void.

No. III.

FORM OF LEGACY

I give and bequeath unto the ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY the sum of £ such legacy to be paid out of such part of my personal estate, not specifically bequeathed, as the law permits to be appropriated by will to such a purpose.

Note.—Gifts may be made by will of stock in the public funds, shares or debentures of railway or other joint-stock companies, or money be paid out of the testator's pure personal estate, or of personal chattels.

Royal Historical Society.

(INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER.)

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL—1896-97.

Patron.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

President.

THE RT. HON. SIR MOUNTSTUART E. GRANT DUFF, G.C.S.I.

Vice-Presidents.

THE LORD ACTON.
HON. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L.
OSCAR BROWNING, M.A.
PROFESSOR MONTAGU BURROWS, M.A., F.S.A.
S. R. GARDINER, M.A., LL.D.
FREDERIC HARRISON.
W. E. H. LECKY, M.A., M.P.
SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, BART., M.P., D.C.L.
H. E. MALDEN, M.A.
PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER, M.A., LL.D.
PROFESSOR H. F. PELHAM, M.A.
THE EARL OF ROSEBERY, K.G.
SIR DONALD MACKENZIE WALLACE.

Council.

C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY, M.A., F.R.G.S.
REV. J. FRANCK BRIGHT, D.D.
JAMES J. CARTWRIGHT, M.A., F.S.A.
REV. W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., LL.D.
REV. J. SILVESTER DAVIES, M.A., F.S.A.
C. H. FIRTH, M.A.
LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE.
JAMES GAIRDNER, LL.D.
MAJOR MARTIN A. S. HUME.
REV. WILLIAM HUNT.
GEORGE HURST, J.P.
I. S. LEADAM, M.A.
PROFESSOR F. W. MAITLAND, M.A., LL.D.
COLONEL G. B. MALLESON, C.S.I.
C. W. C. OMAN, M.A., F.S.A.
PROFESSOR G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D.
B. F. STEVENS.
VEN. ARCHDEACON THORNTON, D.D.
PROFESSOR T. F. TOUT.
J. E. P. WALLIS, M.A.

Treasurer.

R. HOVENDEN, F.S.A., Heathcote, Park Hill Road, Croydon.

Librarian and Clerk.

THOMAS MASON, 115 St. Martin's Lane, W.C.

Director and Hon. Secretary.

HUBERT HALL, F.S.A., 60 Chancery Lane, W.

Royal Historical Society.

Finance Committee.

Rev. Professor W. Cunningham, D.D., LL.D.
C. R. Beazley, M.A., F.R.G.S.
R. Hovenden, F.S.A.
Major Martin A. S. Hume.
H. E. Malden, M.A.
B. F. Stevens.
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director and Hon. Sec.*
T. Mason, *Clerk.*

Library Committee.

C. R. Beazley, M.A., F.R.G.S.
Rev. Professor W. Cunningham, D.D., LL.D.
R. Hovenden, F.S.A.
B. F. Stevens.
The Ven. Archdeacon Thornton, D.D.
J. E. P. Wallis, M.A.
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director and Hon. Sec.*
T. Mason, *Clerk.*

Publication Committee.

Rev. Professor W. Cunningham, D.D., LL.D.
C. H. Firth, M.A.
James Gairdner, LL.D.
S. R. Gardiner, M.A., LL.D.
Frederic Harrison.
Rev. William Hunt.
H. E. Malden, M.A.
R. Hovenden, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director and Hon. Sec.*
T. Mason, *Clerk.*

LIST OF FELLOWS

AND OF

LIBRARIES SUBSCRIBING

ON NOVEMBER 1, 1897.

Names of Members of Council are printed in SMALL CAPITALS.
*Those marked * have compounded for their Annual Subscriptions.*

Aberdeen University.
Abbot, Richard, Forcett, near Darlington.
Aburrow, Charles, Commercial Buildings, Commissioner Street, Johannesburg, Transvaal, S. Africa.
* Ackers, B. St. John, Huntley Manor, Gloucester.
* ACTON, The Lord, Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, Athenæum Club, S.W.
Adelaide Public Library, S. Australia.
Adshead, G. H., Fern Villas, 94 Bolton Road, Pendleton, Manchester.
Aiya, V. Nagam, B.A., Settlement Dewan Peishcar, Travancore, S. India.
Aldenham, Lord, St. Dunstan's Villa, Outer Circle, Regent's Park, N.W.
* Alexander, L. C., Holly Lodge, Upper Park Field, Putney.
Allen, Rev. G. C., M.A., Cranleigh School, Surrey.
Altschul, Dr., F.R.G.S., F.R.S.L., M.C.P., M. Philolog. Soc., 9 Old Bond Street, W.
* Amherst, Earl, Montreal, Sevenoaks, Kent.
Andrew, William, 2 Park Row, Hull.
Andrews, A. Westlake, M.A., Wells House, Malvern Wells, Worcestershire.
Anthony, Charles, 166 Rosendale Road, West Dulwich, S.E.
Arnold, Arthur Claude, M.A., 20 Wilton Street, Grosvenor Place, S.W.
Ashbee, H. S., F.S.A., F.R.G.S., Fowler's Park, Hawkhurst, Kent.
* Ashcombe, Lord, 123 St. George's Square, Pimlico, S.W.
Aspden, Thomas, *England* Office, 291 Strand, W.C.

Backhouse, Jonathan E., Bank, Darlington.
Baer, Messrs. J., & Co., Frankfort.
* Baguley, Henry, 6 Park Road, Wandsworth, S.W.
Baker, James, Sewella Villa, Clifton, Bristol.
Baltimore, Peabody Institute.
Baltimore, Enoch Pratt Library.
Ballinger, John, Librarian, Public Libraries, Cardiff.

Banks, M. L., M.A., The Redlands, Tiverton, N. Devon.
* Barnard, John, Spring Hall, Sawbridgeworth, Herts.
Barnard, F. P., M.A., F.S.A., St. Mary's Abbey, Windermere.
* Barrett, T. Squire, M.A.I., F.Z.S., F.S.S., F.R.B.S., Wistaria House, High Street, Berkhampsted.
* Barry, Frederick, 32 Barcombe Avenue, Streatham Hill.
Bartlett, Franklin, 82 Times Buildings, New York.
Bates, Octavius I., San Rafael, California, U.S.A.
Bateson, Miss Mary, 74 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge.
Baxter, Wynne E., F.R.G.S., 170 Church Street, Stoke Newington.
BEAZLEY, CHARLES RAYMOND, M.A., F.R.G.S., Merton College, Oxford, and 13 The Paragon, Blackheath, S.E.
Bedford, His Grace the Duke of, Woburn Abbey, Beds.
Belfast, Queen's College.
Benson, Arthur Christopher, B.A., Eton College.
Berlin, Bibliothek des Deutschen Reichstages.
Berlin, Royal Library.
Berry, William Thomas, Head Master, Winchester Street Board School, 15 Fulham Place, Maida Vale, W.
Bethlehem, South Penn, U.S.A., Lehigh University.
* Bevington, Colonel S. R., Neckinger Mills, Bermondsey, S.E.
* Biden, Lewis, 1 The Elms, Allison Road, Acton, W.
Billing, Rev. F.A., D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.L., 7 St. Donatt's Road, New Cross, S.E.
Bird, Rev. A. F. Ryder, Forest Hill House, Honor Oak, S.E.
Birmingham Library.
Birmingham Free Library.
Blanch, John Tempest, Hope Villa, 59 Coltart Road, Liverpool.
Bliss, William H., Rome ; 13 Canterbury Road, Oxford.
Bolton Public Free Library.
Bonwick, James, Yarra Yarra, South Vale, Norwood.
Borrow, W. S., B.A., Christ College, Brecon.
Boston Athenæum, U.S.A.
Boston Free Library.
Bowen, E. E., Harrow School.
Boyle, Miss Cecilia, 48 Queen's Gate Terrace, S.W.
Boynton, Thomas, Norman House, Bridlington Quay, Yorks.
*Brackenridge, George Washington, San Antonia, Texas, U.S.A
Bradford Subscription Library.
Braikenridge, William Jerdone, 16 Royal Crescent, Bath.
Bramwell, Sir F. J., F.R.S., 5 Great George Street, Westminster, S.W.
Brent, Francis, F.S.A., 6 Tothill Avenue, Plymouth.
Breslau University Library.
BRIGHT, Rev. JAMES FRANCK, D.D., Master of University College, Oxford.
Brighton Public Library.
Briscoe, John Potter, Public Libraries, Nottingham.
Bristol Museum and Library (Bishop's College).
Britten, Lieut.-Col. John, 106 Cambridge Gardens, North Kensington, W.
* Brocklehurst, Septimus, F.R.G.S., Olinda, Aigburth Drive, Sefton Park, Liverpool.
BRODRICK, The Hon. GEORGE C., D.C.L., Warden of Merton College, Oxford.
Brough, William S., Fowlchurch, Leek, Staffordshire.
Brown, Henry Thomas, Roodeye House, Chester.
Brown, Thomas Forster, Guildhall Chambers, Cardiff.
Browne, Harold C. G., 61 Carey Street, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Browning, Miss M.A., The Beehive, Windsor.
BROWNING, OSCAR, M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Buchanan, William Frederick, F.R.G.S., Union Club, Sydney, New South Wales.

Buck, J. H. Watson, Richmond Terrace, Whitchurch, Salop.
* Burdett-Coutts, The Baroness, 1 Stratton Street, W.
BURROWS, Professor MONTAGU, M.A., F.S.A., Chichele Professo of Modern History, Oxford, 9 Norham Gardens, Oxford.
Bursill, J. F., 'Ye Cave,' Bennerley Road, Wandsworth Common, S.W.
Bushby, H. J., Wormley Bury, Broxbourne.
* Butt, Arthur N., London Institution, Finsbury Circus, E.C.

Caley, Rev. W. B. Russell, M.A., The Vicarage, Watton, S.O., Norfolk.
California University.
Cambridge, Christ's College.
Cambridge, King's College.
Cambridge, St. Catherine's College.
Cambridge, St. John's College.
Cambridge, Trinity College.
Carnidge, William, 36 Monkgate, York.
Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library.
* Carillon, J. Wilson, F.S.A., The Chimes, Richmond, Surrey.
* Carington, H. H. Smith, Stanley Grove, Oxford Road, Manchester.
Carnell, George Frederick, Sevenoaks.
Cartlidge, S. J., School of Art, Hanley, Staffordshire.
CARTWRIGHT, JAMES J., M.A., F.S.A., Public Record Office, London.
* Catlett, William Henry, F.L.S., Burwood, Sydney, N.S.W.
Chadwick, S. J., Lyndhurst, Oxford Road, Dewsbury.
* Chance, James Frederick, M.A., 51 Prince's Gate, Kensington, W.
* Chancellor, E. Beresford, M.A., F.R.H.S., Orchardene, Bedford Park, W.
* Chase, George B., A.M., Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
Cheltenham Permanent Library.
Chicago Public Library.
Chicago, Newberry Library.
Childs, Horatio, St. Martin's Northern Schools, Castle Street, Long Acre, W.C.
Chorlton, Thomas, 32 Brazenose Street, Manchester.
* Church, George Earl, F.R.G.S., 216 Cromwell Road, S. Kensington.
* Cliff, John, F.G.S., Nisbet, Fulneck, near Leeds.
Coate, James, Lea Coombe House, Axminster, Devon.
Cobb, Cyril Stephen, B.C.L., M.A., F.R.G.S., 1 Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, E.C., and Hughenden, Berrylands, Surbiton.
Cockle, George, 9 Bolton Gardens, S.W.
Coleman, Everard Home, F.R.A.S., F.R.G.S., 71 Brecknock Road, N.
Colles, Richard Ramsay, J.P., M.R.I.A., F.S.A., 1 Wilton Terrace, Dublin.
Collins, Rev. Prof. W. E., M.A., 7 Trinity Square, E.C.
Congress Library, Washington, United States, per E. G. Allen, 28 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden.
Cooke-Taylor, R. W., 121 West Regent Street, Glasgow.
Coop, James Ogden, B.A., Albemarle, Ashton-under-Lyne.
Copenhagen Royal Library.
Corbett, John, M.P., Impey, Droitwich.
* Corbett, William, B.A., 44 Roland Gardens, Kensington.
Cornell University.
Cotgreave, Alfred, Rokeby House, Broadway, Stratford, E.
Cottam, Samuel, F.R.A.S., F.C.A., 49 Spring Gardens, Manchester.
Courtauld, George, M.P., Cut Hedge, near Halstead, Essex.
Cowell, Peter, Free Public Library, Liverpool.
Crake, Rev. Edward E., Jevington Rectory, Polegate, Sussex.
Crawford, The Earl of, F.R.S., 2 Cavendish Square, W.
* Crawford, J. W., East Street Mills, Leeds.

Crawley, William John Chetwode, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.G.S., F.G.S., 3 and 4 Ely Place, Dublin.
Crockford, Frederick, Silverdale, Sydenham.
* Crofton, Henry M., F.R.A.S., M.R.I.A., Inchmappa, Ashford, county Wicklow.
* CUNNINGHAM, Rev. W., D.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Currie, John Lang, Eildon, Grey Street, St. Kilda, Victoria, Australia.
Curzon, Frank, 35 Hanover Square, Leeds.

Dalton, Thomas M., Darrington, Camberley, Surrey.
Dames, R. S., Longworth, 21 Herbert Street, Dublin.
* Davids, Professor T. W. Rhys, LL.D., 21 Honor Oak Road, S.E.
Davies, Francis, Robert, Hawthorn, Blackrock, Dublin.
Davies, Sir R. Henry, Bart., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., F.R.G.S., 20 Hyde Park Gate, S.W.
DAVIES, Rev. J. SILVESTER, M.A., F.S.A., Adelaide House, Forts Hill, Enfield.
Davis, Colonel John, A.D.C., F.S.A., Whitmead, Tilford, Surrey.
Dawson, Rev. W., M.A., Susancourt, Loughton, Essex.
* Dees, Robert Richardson, The Hall, Wallsend, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Denham, Edward, 384 Acushnet Avenue, New Bedford, Mass., U.S.A.
Derby, Earl of, 33 St. James's Square, S.W.
De Vaynes, Miss J. A. L., Updown, near Margate.
Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C. W., Bart., 76 Sloane Street, S.W.
* Dimelow, John Gartside, Landsmere, Palatine Road, Didsbury.
Ditchfield, Rev. P. H., Barkham Rectory, Wokingham, Berks.
Doble, C. E., 21 Winchester Road, Oxford.
D'Olière, Mons., Strasburg (c/o. Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trübner & Co.).
Dothie, Rev. Elvery, 47 Longton Grove, Sydenham, S.E.
Downes, Joseph James, 'The Hollies,' Macclesfield.
Drummond, Major Francis Henry Rutherford, c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 45 Pall Mall, S.W.
Dublin, King's Inn Library.
Dublin, National Library of Ireland.
Dublin, Royal Irish Academy.
Durham University.
Dyer, Edward Jerome, 39 Regent's Park Road, N.W.

Earle, Frederick, 2 Ryder Street, St. James's.
Eckersley, James Carlton, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.S.S., Ashfield, Wigan, Lancashire.
Edinburgh University.
Edinburgh Library of the Writers to the Signet.
Edinburgh Public Library.
* Edwin-Cole, James, Swineshead Hall, near Boston, Lincolnshire.
* Elliot, John, Free Library, Wolverhampton.
Elsom, Henry, High Class School, St. Bede's, Hornsea, E. Yorks.
Evans, Sir John, K.C.B., Nash Mills, Hemel Hempstead.
* Evans, Patrick F., 54 Longridge Road, S.W.
* Evans, W., The Spring, Kenilworth, Warwickshire.
Exeter, Devon and Exeter Institution.
* Ezard, Dr. Edward Henry, 220 Lewisham High Road, S.E.

* Farquhar, Sir Walter R., Bart., 18 King Street, St. James's.
Fellows, James J., 94 Paul Street, Finsbury, E.C.

Feret, C. J., 49 Edith Road, West Kensington, S.W.
* Ferguson, Professor John, M.A., LL.D., University, Glasgow.
Ferguson, Robert, M.P., Morton, Carlisle.
* Ferrers, The Earl, Staunton Harrold, Melbourne, Derby.
* Ffytche, John Lewis, The Terrace, Freshwater, Isle of Wight.
Field, Rev. Edmund, M.A., Lancing College, Shoreham.
Figgis, Rev. J. N., M.A., St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.
* Finnemore, The Hon. Mr. Justice, Supreme Court, Pietermaritzburg, Natal, South Africa.
FIRTH, CHARLES HARDING, M.A., 33 Norham Road, Oxford.
Firth, Solomon, 21 Upper Tichbourne Street, Leicester.
Fitch, Edwin F., 66 Bishopsgate Street, E.C.
Fitzgerald, Gerald Beresford, F.S.A., 63 Eaton Square, S.W.
* Fitzgerald, Major William George.
FITZMAURICE, Lord EDMOND GEORGE, Leigh House, Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts.
Fleming, Sandford, C.E., C.M.G., LL.D., Ottawa, Canada.
* Fletcher, John S., Treherne House, Hampstead, N.W.
* Fletcher, Rev. William, D.D., 32 Jasper Road, Norwood.
Fooks, William, M.A., LL.B., 2 Brick Court, Temple, E.C.
Ford, John Rawlinson, Quarrydene, Weetwood, Leeds.
Fox, Francis F., Yate House, Chipping Sodbury, Gloucestershire.
* Freake, Lady, 11 Cranley Place, S.W.
Freeman, J. J., 23 Abingdon Street, S.W.
Fryer, Alfred C., Ph.D., M.A., F.C.S., 13 Eaton Crescent, Clifton, Bristol.
* Furnivall, Frederick J., M.A., LL.D., 3 St. George's Square, Primrose Hill, N.W.

GAIRDNER, JAMES, West View, Pinner, Middlesex.
Galbraith, Rev. Matthew, M.A., F.R.G.S., Ferryhill, Aberdeen, N.B.
Gardiner, F. J., The Crescent, Wisbech.
Gardiner, Henry Trevor, 22 Sutton Road, Watford, Herts.
GARDINER, SAMUEL RAWSON, M.A., LL.D., 7 South Park, Sevenoaks.
Garrett, J. P., 38 Great James Street, Bedford Row, W.C.
* Garstin, John Ribton, M.A., F.S.A., M.R.I.A., Braganstown, Castle Bellingham, co. Louth.
Gasquet, Rev. Francis Aidan, D.D., St. Gregory's College, Downside, Bath.
Gill, John, Penryn, Cornwall.
Giuseppi, M. S., F.S.A., Public Record Office, Fetter Lane, E.C.
Glasgow, Baillie's Institution.
Glasgow, Faculty of Procurators' Library.
Glasgow, Mitchell Library.
Glasgow, University Library.
Godfrey, William, 6 Pier Road, Rosherville, Gravesend.
Göttingen University.
* Gough, Henry, Sandcroft, Redhill, Surrey.
Gower, Lord Ronald, Stafford House, St. James's, London.
* GRANT DUFF, The Right Hon. Sir MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE, G.C.S.I., *President*, 11 Chelsea Embankment, S.W.; and Lexden Park, Colchester.
Green, Rev. Edward Dyer, M.A., Bromborough Rectory, Birkenhead, Cheshire.
Green, Samuel S., Free Public Library, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A.
Greenfield, Benjamin Wyatt, F.S.A., 4 Cranbury Terrace, Southampton.
Greifswald University.
* Grey, Sir George, K.C.B., Auckland, New Zealand.
Grimsey, B. P., Stoke Lodge, Ipswich.
Guilding, Rev. J. M., St. Lawrence's Vicarage, Reading.

Hackwood, Frederick W., J.P., 66 Bridge Street, Wednesbury.
* Hailstone, Edward, 9 Rue de Tocqueville, Paris.
Hale, Surgeon-Major Thomas Egerton, B.A., M.D., V.C., Faddiley Lodge, near Nantwich, Cheshire.
Hales, Professor John W., M.A., 1 Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill, N.W.
Hall, Rev. Enoch, Glensdale, Poole, Dorset.
HALL, HUBERT, F.S.A., *Director and Hon. Sec.*, 60 Chancery Lane, W.C.
Hall, William Robert, Broxbourne, Herts.
Halle, König Universitäts Bibliothek.
Hamburg City Library.
Hamilton, Walter, Ellarbee, Elms Road, Clapham Common.
Hannay, David, 169 Camberwell Grove, S.E.
Harben, Sir Henry, Seaford Lodge, Fellows Road, N.W.
Hardcastle, Joseph Alfred, 54 Queen's Gate Terrace, S.W.
Hare, Sholto H., 7 Litfield Place, Clifton, Bristol.
Harris, James Howard, Porthleven, Helston, Cornwall.
* HARRISON, FREDERIC, 38 Westbourne Terrace, W.
Harvard University Library, c/o Kegan Paul, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, W.C.
* Harvey, William Marsh, Goldington Hall, Bedford.
Hatt, John Brander, St. Benedict's Abbey, Fort Augustus, N.B.
Hay, James A. C., C.E., M.R.S.G.S., c/o Col. Hay, Craignish, Filsham Park, St. Leonards.
Headlam, J. W., King's College, Cambridge.
Healey, Edward Charles, Wyphurst, near Guildford.
Heap, Ralph, 1 Brick Court, Temple, E.C.
Heaviside, Rev. George, B.A., F.R.G.S., 7 Grosvenor Street, Coventry.
Herries, The Lord, Everingham Park, York.
* Herz, Dr. Cornelius, F.R.G.S., Bournemouth.
Heywood, James, F.R.S., 26 Kensington Palace Gardens, W.
Hill, Frank H., 3 Morpeth Terrace, Victoria Street, S.W.
Hill, Rev. H. Ernest, Abbey School, Beckenham.
Hill, Samuel Thomas, F.R.G.S., Stebonhethe, Northcote Road, St. Margaret's, Twickenham.
* Hinmers, William, Cleveland House, Lancaster Road, Eccles, Manchester.
Hodgkin, Dr. Thomas, Bamburgh Keep, Bedford.
Hodgson, Shadworth Hollway, 45 Conduit Street, W.
Holmes, Emra, F.R.S.A.I., 11 Bon Accord Crescent, Aberdeen.
Hooper, George N., Elmleigh, Hayne Road, Beckenham, S.E.
Hopkins, J. Satchell, Jesmond Grove, Edgbaston, Birmingham.
Hornby, Rev. James John, D.D., F.R.G.S., Provost of Eton, Eton College, Windsor.
* Horniman, F. J., Surrey Mount, Forest Hill, S.E.
* Hovenden, Frederick, Glenlea, Thurlow Park Road, West Dulwich, S.E.
HOVENDEN, ROBERT, *Treasurer*, Heathcote, Park Hill Road, Croydon.
Howarth, W., 10 Clifford's Inn, E.C.
Hughes, Arthur, 15 Montague Road, Richmond, Surrey.
Hull Public Library.
Hull Subscription Library.
HUME, Major MARTIN ANDREW SHARP, 14 Cavendish Mansions, Portland Place, W.
Humphery, George Richard, 16 St. Donatt's Road, New Cross, S.E.
HUNT, REV. WILLIAM, 24 Phillimore Gardens, Campden Hill, W.
HURST, GEORGE, J.P., Kingsbrook House, St. Mary's, Bedford.
Hussanally, A. A., Queen's College, Oxford.
Hutton, Rev. William Holden, St. John's College, Oxford.

Inderwick, F. A., Q.C., 8 Warwick Square, S.W.
Ireland, National Library of (*See* Dublin).

Jackson, Richard Charles, Bowyer Park, Camberwell, S.E.
Jago-Trelawny, Major-General John, F.R.G.S., Coldrenick, Liskeard, Cornwall.
James, John, B.A., St. Teilo's School, Llandilo, Carmarthenshire.
Jamieson, George Auldjo, M.A., F.S.A., 37 Drumsheugh Gardens, Edinburgh.
Jefferson, Rev. John, Lime Grove, Rawtenstall, Lancs.
Jessopp, Rev. Augustus, D.D., Scarning Rectory, East Dereham, Norfolk.
Johnson, W. G., 46 Gower Street, Bedford Square, W.C.
Jonas, Alfred C., Fairfield, Poundfald, Penclawdd, R.S.O., Glam.
* Jones, Joseph, Abberley Hall, Stourport, Worcestershire.
Jones, Charles Edwin, 9 Manor Terrace, Lea Bridge Road, Leyton, Essex.
Jones, Rev. Owen Baldwyn, 63 Mount Street, Northwood, Hanley, Staffs.
Judd, James, J.P., East Knoll, Upper Norwood, S.E.

H.H. Kerala Varma, of Travancore, India.
Kerr, Robert, 23 Milton Place, Halifax.
Kingston, Alfred, Royston, Herts.
Kinman, G. W., M.A., The Grammar School, Dolgelly.
Kirkpatrick, Robert, 1 Queen Square, Strathbungo, Glasgow.
Knibbs, Rev. Charles, Heatherdon, Tor Vale, Torquay.
Königsberg Royal Library.

Lach-Szyrma, Rev. W. S., Barkingside Vicarage, Ilford.
de Lamarre, Louis Bert, Bridgetown, Barbados, B.W.I.
Lane, Rev. C. Arthur, 'Parkside,' Acton Vale, W.
* Larkin, Matthew, J.P., F.R.G.S.
Lawson, Rev. John Sharpe, M.A., LL.D., St. George's Vicarage, Barnsley, Yorks.
Lawton, William, Nunthorpe, York.
LEADAM, ISAAC SAUNDERS, M.A., 117 St. George's Square, S.W.
Leathes, F. de M., Radnor Park Road, Folkestone.
* LECKY, Right Hon. W. E. H., M.A., M.P., 38 Onslow Gardens, S.W.
Leeds Library.
Leggott, J. H., 104 Derby Road, Nottingham.
Leicester Free Library.
Lewis, Rev. Thomas Curling, Dodbrooke Rectory, Kingsbridge, Devon.
* Liberty, Arthur Lasenby, F.R.S.S., F.Z.S., The Manor House, The Lee, near Great Missenden, Bucks.
Liebmann, Professor James Alexander, F.R.S.L., F.R.G.S., Diocesan College, Rondebosch, Cape Town.
Lincoln, Dean and Chapter.
Lindsley, Dr. J., 135 North Spruce Street, Nashville, Tennessee, U.S.A.
* Lloyd, Rev. John, M.A., Llanvapley Rectory, Abergavenny.
Lloyd, J. A., The Studio, Marlborough, Wilts.
Lloyd, Richard, 2 Addison Crescent, Kensington, W.
* Lobb, John, F.R.G.S., *Christian Age* Office, St. Bride Street, E.C.
* Lodge, R., M.A., 10 University Gardens, Glasgow.
London, Athenæum Club, S.W.
London, Bank of England, E.C.

London, Battersea Public Libraries.
London, City of London (Guildhall).
London, Gray's Inn.
London, Hammersmith Free Public Library.
London, House of Commons.
London, Inner Temple.
London, Junior Constitutional Club.
London, Law Institution.
London, Lincoln's Inn.
London, London Institution.
London, London Library.
London, London University.
London, Middle Temple.
London, National Liberal Club.
London, National Portrait Gallery.
London, New University Club.
London, Oxford and Cambridge Club.
London, Public Record Office.
London, Reform Club.
London, Royal Institution.
London, St. George's, Hanover Square, Public Library.
London, St. Paul's Cathedral Library.
London, Sion College Library.
London, Westminster Public Library.
LUBBOCK, Sir JOHN, Bart., P.C., M.P., D.C.L., F.R.S., F.L.S., 2 St. James's Square, S.W.
* Lydall, John French, 37 John Street, Bedford Row, W.C.
* Lyle, Thomas, M.A., Grove House, Shacklewell Lane, E.

* Macandrew, W., Westwood House, near Colchester.
* Mackeson, Edward, F.S.A., 13 Hyde Park Square, W.
* Mackinlay, David, 6 Great Western Terrace, Hillhead, Glasgow.
Maclean, William, F.R.G.S., 31 Camperdown Place, Great Yarmouth.
Madge, S. J., 11 Palatine Road, Stoke Newington, N.
Maguire, Thomas Mil'er, M.A., LL.D., Earl's Court Square, S.W.
MAITLAND, Professor F. W., M.A., LL.D., Downing College, Cambridge.
MALDEN, HENRY ELLIOT, M.A., Kitlands, Holmwood, Surrey.
MALLESON, Col. G. B., C.S.I., 27 West Cromwell Road, S.W.
Malleson, J. P., B.A., The Vicarage, Great Tew, Enstone, Oxon.
Manchester, Chetham's Library.
Manchester Public Libraries.
Manchester, Owens College.
Marburg University Library.
Margetts, William George, A.I.C.E., F.R.G.S., Ring's Lodge, near Rochester.
Marriott, W. K., Manor House, Barking, Essex.
Marriott, W. T., Sandal Grange, Wakefield.
* Marsden, Mrs., 129 Chesterton Road, Kensington, W.
Marsh, G. W. B., B.A., Shalfleet House, Powerscroft Road, Lower Clapton, N.E.
Maskelyne, Anthony St. John Story, 53 Rossetti Mansions, Chelsea, S.W.
MASON, THOMAS, *Librarian and Clerk*, 115 St. Martin's Lane, W.C.
Massachusetts, Harvard College.
Massachusetts Historical Society.
Massachusetts, Wellesley College.
Mate, William, Directory Office, Bournemouth.
Mathews, E. R. N., Librarian, Public Libraries, Bristol.
Maybank, John Thomas, High Street, Dorking.

Melbourne Public Library.
Melville, Muller & Co., 12 Ludgate Square, E.C.
Mercer, W. J., 12 Marine Terrace, Margate.
Merriam, C. P., 79 Highbury New Park, N.
Mesney, General William, F.R.G.S., 22 Swatow Road, Shanghai, China.
* Metcalfe, Rev. James, M.A., Vicarage, West Teignmouth.
Michigan, Detroit Public Library.
Michigan University.
Michigan, Hoyt Public Library.
Middlesborough Free Library.
* Miggs, John Gilbert, 123 Cromwell Road, South Kensington, S.W.
Miles, Colonel S. B., c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 45 Pall Mall, S.W.
Millais, Lady, 2 Palace Gate, Kensington, S.W.
Milledge, Zillwood, J.P., The Fernery, Weymouth.
Milman, Rev. W. H., M.A., Sion College, Victoria Embankment, E.C.
* Milward, R. H., 41 Waterloo Street, Birmingham.
Minneapolis, Athenæum Library.
Minnesota, University of.
Moloney, Sir Cornelius Alfred, K.C.M.G., Government House, Grenada, Windward Islands.
Molyneux, Lt.-Colonel Edmund, F.R.G.S., Warren Lodge, Wokingham, Berks.
Money-Coutts, Francis Burdett, Walsingham House, Piccadilly.
Montefiore, A., 135 Finchley Road, Hampstead.
Moore, Stuart A., F.S.A., 6 King's Bench Walk, Inner Temple, E.C.
Moore, William, B.A., 56 Springfield Road, N.W.
Morris, George, 12 St. Andrew's Pavement, Stoke Newington, N.
Morrison, Hew, Librarian, Public Library, Edinburgh.
Mosley, George, F.G.S., The Commercial College, York.
* MÜLLER, Professor F. MAX, M.A., LL.D., 7 Norham Gardens, Oxford.
Mullins, J. D., Free Library, Birmingham.
Münich, Charles Jean, The War Office, Pall Mall, S.W.
Münich Royal Library.

Naylor, Robert Anderton, F.R.G.S., Cuerden Hall, Thelwall, Cheshire. (*Post town*, Warrington.)
Newcastle-on-Tyne Literary and Philosophical Society.
Newman, George, M.B., M.Ch., 20 Queen Square, W.C.
New York, Astor Library.
New York, Brooklyn Library.
New York, State Library.
New York, Young Men's Christian Association.
Nichols, Francis Morgan, M.A., F.S.A., Lawford Hall, Manningtree, Essex.
Nichols, John Bruce, Grandon Lodge, Holmswood, Dorking.
Nihjoff, Martinus, The Hague.
Norfolk and Norwich Library.
Northampton, The Most Honourable Marquis of, K.G., Castle Ashby, Northampton.
Northumberland, His Grace the Duke of, K.G., 2 Grosvenor Place, S.W.
Norwich, Dean and Chapter Library.
Nutt & Co., Messrs., 270 Strand, W.C.

* O'Donnavan, William, LL.D., 15 Belgrave Road, Rathmines, Dublin.
Oldham, Union Street Library.
Oliverson, Richard, 37 Gloucester Square, Hyde Park.

Oman, C. W. C., M.A., F.S.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Ord, Clement, M.A., 6 Hughenden Road, Clifton, Bristol.
Orsbach, Rev. Engelbert Baron von, F.R.G.S., Mottingham House, near Eltham, Kent.
Owen, Edward Humphrey, F.S.A., Ty Coch, Carnarvon.
Oxford, All Souls College.
Oxford, Balliol College.
Oxford, Exeter College.
Oxford, Magdalen College.
Oxford, Merton College.
Oxford, Queen's College.
Oxford, St. John's College.
Oxford Union Society.
* Oxford, Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of, Cuddesdon Palace, Wheatley, Oxfordshire.

Palmer, James Foster, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S.E., 8 Royal Avenue, Chelsea College, S.W.
Palmer, Rev. Feilding, M.A., Eastcliffe, Chepstow.
Parker, Henry, C.E., Irrigation Officer, P.W.D., Ceylon.
Parkin, Thomas, M.A., F.R.G.S., Fairseat, High Wickham, Hastings.
Paris, National Library.
* Parr, J. Charlton, Grappenhall Heyes, Warrington.
Parrish, Rev. Henry, D.D , 2435 Kimball Street, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.
Patterson, James K., Ph.D., President of the Agricultural College, Lexington, Kentucky, U.S.A.
Paul, Alexander, 4 Tavistock Square, W.C.
Pelham, Professor H. F., M.A., Oxford.
Pembroke, The Earl of, F.R.G.S , Wilton House, Salisbury, Wilts.
Penny, Arthur Paul, 18 Bedford Place, W.C.
Penny, Rev. C. W., Shute End House, Wokingham.
* Perry, Major Ottley, F.R.G.S., F.S.A., 7 Bedford Street, Bolton, Lancs.
* Peyster, General John Watts de, 59 East 21st Street, New York.
Pflugk-Harttung, Professor Dr. Julius von, 14, York Strasse, Berlin.
Philadelphia Library Company.
Philip, George, 32 Fleet Street, E.C.
* Pickering, J., F.R.G.S., 86 Thicket Road, Anerley.
Pike, Rev. Clement E., Beechcroft, Holywood, co. Down.
Pooley, Frank, 18 Hacken's Hey, Liverpool.
* Porges, Theodore, F.R.G.S., 17 Avenue Friedland, Paris.
Potts, Lewis W., St. Martin's House, Stamford Hill, N.
Pratt, A. T. C., 1 Eastmearn Road, West Dulwich, S.E.
Preston Library (Dr. Shepherd's).
Preston, Thomas, F.S.A., Privy Council Office, Whitehall, S.W.
Price, Cormell, M.A., B.C.L., F.R.G.S., 38 Powis Square, W.
Prothero, Professor G. W., Litt.D., 2 Eton Terrace, Edinburgh.
Pym, Guy, Esq., M.P., 35 Cranley Gardens, S.W.

Quinn, Michael Thomas, M.A., 22 Powis Square, W.

Ragland-Powel, John, Ludlow, Salop.
Raikes, Lt.-Colonel G. A., F.S.A., 13 Carlton Road, Ealing, W.
Rama Krishna, T., B.A., Thottakkan House, Poonamalli Road, Madras.

Ramsay, Sir James Henry, Bart., Banff, Alyth, N.B.
Rannie, David Watson, Conheath, Dumfries, N.B.
Reading Corporation Library.
Reform Club, Pall Mall, S.W.
Reich, Dr. Emil, 17 Tavistock Road, Westbourne Park, W.
Reichel, H. R., Principal University College, Bangor.
Renshaw, Walter Charles, Q.C., 5 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn.
Richardson, Colonel J. G. F., Ph.D., J.P., Elmfield, Knighton, Leicester.
Richardson, Ralph, M.D., 4 Park Row, Albert Gate, W.
Ridgway, W. J. P., M.A., Barrow Hill, Chesterfield.
Ripon, The Most Hon. the Marquess of, K.G., D.C.L., F.R.S., 1 Carlton Gardens, S.W.
Rochdale Free Public Library.
Rome, William, F.S.A., Oxford Lodge, Wimbledon Common.
Ropes, Arthur Reed, M.A., The Ferns, Sunnyside Road, Hornsey Rise, N.
* Ropes, J. C., 99 Mount Vernon, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
* Rosebery, The Earl of, K.G., Lansdowne House, W.
Ross, Joseph Carne, Esq., Parsonage Nook, Withington, Manchester.
Rugby, Temple Reading Room.
Rumbold, His Excellency Sir Horace, Bart., G.C.B., British Embassy, Vienna.
Rusden, George William, F.R.G.S., Cotmandene, South Yarra, Melbourne.
* Russell, Hon. Rollo, Pembroke Lodge, Richmond, Surrey.
* Ryder, Charles, The Brewery, Leeds.
Rylands, Mrs., Longford Hall, near Manchester.
Rymer, Samuel Lee, J.P., Pevensey, Wellesley Road, Croydon.

St. Andrews University.
Sabel, Ernest, F.R.G.S., Lynton House, South Side, Clapham Common, S.W.
* Safford, John Burham, F.G.S., Parkshot House, Richmond, Surrey.
Samuel, Harry Sylvester, 80 Onslow Gardens, S.W.
Saunders, C. T., 20 Temple Row, Birmingham.
Score, H. Berkeley, Lathom Park, Ormskirk.
Seath, Thomas B., Sunnyoaks, Langbank, Renfrewshire.
Seebohm, Frederic, The Hermitage, Hitchin.
* Seebohm, Hugh Exton, The Hermitage, Hitchin.
Shannon, J. S., St. Martin's School, York.
Sharp, J. Fox, The Park, Hull.
Shaw, William Arthur, M.A., Sandown House, Byfleet Road, Weybridge.
Sheffield Free Library.
Sherren, John Angel, Helmsley, Stavordale Road, Weymouth.
Short, R. M., Herbert Road, Solihull, near Birmingham.
Sikes, Rev. Thomas B., M.A., Warbleton Rectory, Heathfield, Sussex.
* Simpson, Edward, Walton Hall, Wakefield.
Simpson, Percy, F.R.G.S., F.Z.S., Poste Restante, Imperial Institute, S.W.
* Simson, Alfred, 4 Fairlie Place, Calcutta ; London address, c/o Messrs. Kilburn, Brown & Co., 28 St. Mary Axe, E.C.
Skrine, Henry Duncan, Claverton Manor, near Bath.
Smith, E. Cozens, F.S.S., 1 Old Broad Street, E.C.
Smith, George H., 30 Park Crescent, Groves, York.
Smith, Hubert, Brooklynne, Willes Road, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire
* Smith, W. Bickford, Trevarno, Helston, Cornwall.
Smythe, David M., Methven Castle, Perth.
Sotheran, H. C., Strand, W.C.
Southport Free Library.
Speth, George William, La Tuna, Bromley, Kent.

Spry, William James Joseph, R.N., F.R.G.S., Therapia, St. Andrew's Road, Southsea.
Stack, G. A., Professor of History, Presidency College, Calcutta; Editor of the *Calcutta Review*, Calcutta, India.
* Stanley, Walmsley, F.R.G.S., The Knowle, Leigham Court Rd., Streatham, S.W.
Stead, Richard Harvey, Grammar School, Folkestone.
Steele, Joseph, M.D., c/o Mr. Alderman Rymer, J.P., Wellesley Road, Croydon.
STEVENS, B. F., 4 Trafalgar Square, W.C.
Stevens, George Richard, Greenmount, Hong Kong.
* Stewart, General Alexander P., LL.D., Oxford, Miss., U.S.A.
Stewart, Rev. John, Penrhyn, Cornwall.
Stockdale, Thomas, Spring Lea, Leeds.
Stockholm Royal Library.
Stone, J. H., Presidency College, Madras, India.
Stonyhurst College.
* Strathcona and Mount Royal, Lord, 1157 Dorchester Street, Montreal, Canada.
Stryker, General William S., Adjutant-General of New Jersey, Trenton, New Jersey, U.S.A.
Sulley, Philip, Parkhurst, Dumfries.
Surr, Watson, 57 Old Broad Street, E.C.
Sydney Free Library.
Sydney University.
Sykes, John, M.D., Doncaster.
Syms, Richard, Melbourne House, Barking Road, E.

* Taylor, Miss Helen, Avignon, France.
* Teele, Rev. Albert K., D.D., Milton, Mass, U.S.A.
Tempany, Thomas William, Fernleigh, King's Road, Richmond, Surrey.
Terry, Rev. G. F., 20 Denbigh Road, Bayswater, W.
Thornton Percy M., M.P., Battersea Rise, Clapham Junction.
THORNTON, The Ven. Archdeacon, D.D., Vicar of St. John's, Notting Hill; Boyle Lecturer; Vice-President of the Victoria Institute; 63 Ladbroke Grove, Notting Hill, W.
Thrupp, Miss Adelaide, Merrow House, near Guildford.
Toplis, Miss Sophia Grace, 63 Bartholomew Road, N.W.
Toronto Public Library
Torr, Herbert James, Riseholme Hall, near Lincoln.
TOUT, Professor T. F., 21 Mauldeth Road, Withington, Manchester.
Traherne, Capt. George G., R.A., The Citadel, Plymouth.
Traherne, L. E., Coedriglan Park, Cardiff.
Travis-Cook, John, 14 Parliament Street, Hull.
* Turton, Robert Bell, 24 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, and 7*c* Lower Belgrave Street, S.W.

Udal, The Hon. John Symonds, Attorney-General of Fiji, Suva, Fiji.

Vaughan, Captain Wilmot, 159 Rue de la Pompe, Paris.
Ventura, M., 18 Coleman Street, E.C.
Verney, Lady, Claydon House, Bucks.
Victory, Louis K., 154 Clonliffe Road, Dublin.
Vienna, Imperial Library.
Vienna, University Library.
Vincent, J. A., Needham Market, Suffolk.

Wadling, Henry, Lamb Buildings, Temple, E.C.
* Wagner, Henry, F.S.A., 13 Half Moon Street, Piccadilly, W.
Wakefield, Rev. Thomas, F.R.G.S., 80 Curzon Street, Derby.
* Wakeman, Henry O., All Souls College, Oxford.
Walford, John Edward, C.C., Knightrider Street, E.C.
* Walker, Philip F., F.R.G.S., 36 Princes Gardens, S.W.
* Walker, Robert, F.R.G.S., Ormidale, Knighton Park Road, Leicester.
Walker, T. A., Weston College, Natal.
* WALLACE, Sir DONALD MACKENZIE, St. Ermin's Mansions, Caxton Street, S.W.
WALLIS, JOHN E. P., M.A., 2 Mitre Court Buildings, E.C.
Walsh, W., 18 Sternhold Avenue, Streatham Hill.
Ward, John Edward, F.R.G.S., Woolmer Hill House, Haslemere.
Warre, General Sir Henry J., K.C.B., F.R.G.S., 35 Cadogan Place, S.W.
Warren, Major-General Sir Charles, R.E., 44 St. George's Road, S.W.
Washington, Congress Library.
* Watson, Rev. Albert, M.A., 20 Norham Gardens, Oxford.
* Watts, Rev. Herbert C., Priory Cottage, Bicester, Oxon.
Welby, Right Hon. Lord, G.C.B., 11 Stratton Street, W.
Welch, Charles, Corporation Library, Guildhall, E.C.
Wesley, Messrs., & Son, Essex Street, Strand, W.C.
West, William Nowell, F.R.G.S., 30 Montague Street, Russell Square, W.C.
* Westminster, The Duke of, K.G., Grosvenor House, W.
* Whatton, J. S., 18 Hyde Park Street, W.
Wheeler, Frederic Elijah, VIII. Langegasse 7, Vienna.
Whitehead, Sir James, Bart., Wilmington Manor, near Dartford, Kent.
*Whitehead, Rev. J. H., M.A., The Poplars, Alsager, Stoke-on-Trent.
Wild, Ernest E., B.A., LL.M., F.R.C.S., Great Russell Mansions, Great Russell Street, W.C.
Wilkinson, R. J., Singapore, Straits Settlements.
Williams, E. P., Elmhurst, Westcombe Park Road, Blackheath, S.E.
* Williams, Rev. J. D., M.A.
Williams, Miss Margaret Elizabeth, 2 Hardman Street, Liverpool.
Williams, Richard, Celynog, Newtown, North Wales.
Williams, Dr. Thos. E. H., Junior United Service Club, Charles Street, S.W.
Williamson, John M., Melville House, Overhill Road, Dulwich, S.E.
Wilson, Rev. Edwin William, Lorne Villa, 19 Strafford Street, Millwall, E.
Windsor Royal Library.
Winterton, M. L., Sexey's Trade School, Bruton, Bath.
Wonnacott, J., F.G.S., F.R.G.S., Wadham House, Liskeard, Cornwall.
Wood, Alexander, M.A., 3 St. Peter's Square, Ravenscourt Park, W.
Wood, William, Exton House, 173 Choumert Road, East Dulwich, S.E.
Wood, Sir Albert W., Garter King of Arms, F.S.A., 69 St. George's Road, Pimlico.
Woodroffe, Prof. Latham James, M.A., 81 Waterloo Road, Dublin.
Worcester Public Library.
* Worsfold, Thomas Cato, F.R.S.L., Addison House, Balham Hill, S.W.
Wren, Walter, 7 Powis Square, W.
Wright, W. H. K., Free Library, Plymouth.
Wurtzburg, John Henry, Clavering House, 2 De Gray Road, Leeds.
Wyatt-Davies, Ernest, B.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Wyles, Thomas, F.G.S., The College, Buxton.

Yale College.
Yates, James, Public Library, Leeds.
York, His Grace the Archbishop of, Bishopthorpe, York.
Young, Miss Ernestine C., High School for Girls, 5 Portland Place, Bath.
Young, Herbert Edward, White Hart Street, High Wycombe, Bucks.

Zerffi, Henry Charles, 14 Randolph Crescent, Maida Vale, W.

HONORARY FELLOWS.

His Majesty King Leopold II., King of the Belgians.
His Majesty King Oscar II., King of Sweden and Norway.
Bismarck, His Excellency Prince von.

Agnew, Sir J. W., M.D., Hobart, Tasmania.

Bytschkoff, His Excellency Athanasius Th. de, Director of the Imperial Library, St. Petersburg.

Coelho, Lieut.-Colonel Jose Maria Latino, Professor of Geology, Lisbon.
Crawford, The Right Hon. the Earl of, Haigh Hall, near Wigan, Lancs.
Crombie, Rev. J. M., M.A., F.L.S., Holmwood, Dorking, Surrey.

Dana, Edward S., Ph.D., New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.

Fayrer, Sir Joseph, K.C.S.I., F.R.S., Athenæum Club, London.

Gorostiraga, Don Angel de, National Archæological Society, Madrid.

Liversidge, Professor A., M.A., F.R.S., University of Sydney, N.S.W.
London, The Right Rev. the Bishop of, The Palace, Fulham, S.W.
Lyte, Sir H. C. Maxwell, K.C.B., M.A., F.S.A., Public Record Office, E.C.

Méldahl, Count, President of the Royal Academy of Arts, Copenhagen.
Mommsen, Professor Theodor, Charlottenburg, Berlin.
Monod, Professor Gabr., 108 Boulevard St.-Germain, Paris.
Montelius, Dr. Oscar, Society of Antiquaries, Sweden.
Montjau, M. Edouard M. de, Society of Ethnography, Paris.

Nares, Admiral Sir George, K.C.B., F.R.S., 5 Westminster Chambers, Victoria Street, London, S.W.

Oppert, M. Julius, Professor of Assyrian Philology and Archæology in the College of France.
Oxford, The Right Rev. the Bishop of, Cuddesdon Palace, Oxford.

Pomialovsky, His Excellency Professor John, Imperial University, St. Petersburg.
Poole, R. L., M.A., Ph.D., 5 Beaumont Street, Oxford.

Rawlinson, Rev. Canon, M.A., F.R.G.S., late Camden Professor of History, Oxford.
Roberts, Field Marshal the Rt. Hon. Lord, United Service Club, London, S.W.

Siegel, Dr. Heinrich, Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1 Schottenhof, Vienna.
Slafter, Rev. Edmund F., A.M., D.D., 249 Berkeley Street, Boston, U.S.A.
Stanley, H. M., D.C.L., LL.D., 2 Richmond Terrace, Whitehall, S.W.
Stieda, His Excellency Professor Dr. Ludwig, Königsberg University, Germany.

Thompson, Sir Edward Maunde, K.C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A., British Museum, W.C.

Waxel, Platon L. de, Ph.D., Vice-Director of the Chancery of Foreign Affairs, Moïka 26, St. Petersburg.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Ashley, Professor W. J., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

Balzani, Count Ugo, 5 Via Vicenza, Rome.
Bémont, Chas., Maître des Conférences à l'Ecole des Chartes, 9 Rue de Condé, Paris.
Bonwick, James, Yarra Yarra, South Vale, Norwood.
Brock, R. A., Richmond, Virginia.
Broglie, Le Duc de, Rue Solferino, Paris.
Bülow, Dr. G. von, Keeper of the State Archives, Stettin.
Busch, Dr. Wilhelm, Freiburg.

Cooke, Samuel, M.A., F.G.S., Poona, India.

Davis, Hon. N. Darnell, C.M.G., Georgetown, British Guiana.
Delisle, Léopold, Membre de l'Institut, Administrateur Général de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
Drowne, Henry Thayer, A.M., 147 West 36th Street, New York.
Drowne, Rev. T. Stafford, D.D., Bedford Avenue, N.; Winthrop Street, Brooklyn, New York.

Gross, Professor Charles, Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

Jameson, Professor J. F., Providence, Rhode Island, U.S.A.

Lee, G. H., 113 Devonshire Street, Boston, U.S.A.
Liebermann, Professor Felix, Ph.D., LL.D., 10 Bendlerstrasse, Berlin, W.
Litton, Hon. Robert T., M.A., F.G.S., F.R.G.S., Hon. Sec. Historical Society of Australasia, 45 Queen Street, Melbourne.

Maulde, M. de, Secrétaire Général de la Société d'Histoire Diplomatique, 10 Boulevard Raspail, Paris.
Mijatovitch, His Excellency Chas., 27 Pembridge Gardens, W.

O'Reilly, P. S., M.D., St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.

Phillips, Henry, Junr., A.M., Ph.D., 1811 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, U.S.A.

Ravenell, H. E., Spartanburg, South Carolina, U.S.A.

Sarolea, Professor Charles, Edinburgh University.
Sorel, Albert, Membre de l'Académie Française, 17 Rue de Vaugirard, Paris.

Theal, Hon. George, Native Affairs Office, Cape Town.

Villari, Professor P., Florence.
Vinogradoff, Professor, Moscow.

The Council are not responsible for the accuracy of the foregoing list, but they request that any inaccuracy or omission may be pointed out to the Secretary, and that all changes of address may be notified to him, so that delay in forwarding communications and the Publications of the Society may be avoided.

FOREIGN ASSOCIATIONS

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE SOCIETY.

AUSTRALIA.

The Royal Society of New South Wales.

AUSTRIA.

The Imperial Academy of Sciences, Vienna.

BELGIUM.

Académie royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts, Palais des Académies, Brussels.
Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles, 11 Rue Ravenstein, Brussels.

BOHEMIA.

The Royal Society of Bohemia, Prague.

CANADA.

L'Institut Canadien-français d'Ottawa.
Geological and Natural History Survey Museum, Ottawa.
The Literary and Historical Society, Quebec.

DENMARK.

The Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, Copenhagen.

FRANCE.

Société d'Ethnographie, 28 Rue Mazarine, Paris.

GERMANY.

The Historical Society of Berlin.

ITALY.

The State Archives of Tuscany.
British and American Archæological Society of Rome, 20 Via S. Basilio, Rome.

PORTUGAL.

The Royal Academy of Sciences, Lisbon.

RUSSIA.

The Imperial Archæological Society, St. Petersburg.

SPAIN.

The Royal Historical Society, Madrid.
The National Archæological Society, Madrid.

SWEDEN.

The Royal Society of Antiquaries of Sweden, Stockholm.
The Royal Academy of Belles-Lettres, History, and Antiquities, Stockholm.

TASMANIA.

The Royal Society of Tasmania.

UNITED STATES.

The Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
New England Historic-Genealogical Society, Boston, Mass.
The Historical Society of New York, 170 Second Avenue, New York.
The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
The Academy of Arts and Sciences, New Haven, Connecticut.
The Georgia Historical Society, Savannah, Georgia.
The Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
The Historical Society of Rhode Island, Providence, R.I.
The Historical Society of Virginia, Richmond.
The Historical Society of Maryland, Baltimore.
The Historical Society of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.
The Historical Society of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota.
The Historical Society of South Carolina.
The Historical Society of Vermont.
The Historical Society of Michigan.
The Historical Society of New Jersey.
The Historical Society of Maine.
Peabody Institute, Baltimore, U.S.A., care of E. G. Allen, 28 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden.

LIBRARIES TO WHICH THE SOCIETY'S TRANSACTIONS ARE PRESENTED.

Mason Science College, Birmingham.
South Kensington Museum.
Royal Institution, Albemarle Street, W.
Chetham's Library, Hunt's Bank, Manchester.
Imperial Institute, Imperial Institute Road, S.W.
Library of Political Science, 10 Adelphi Terrace, W.C.

TRANSACTIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Transactions. Old Series. Vols. 1 to 10 (vols. 2 and 3 are out of print).

Transactions. New Series. Vols. 1 to 11.

England and Napoleon in 1803. Being the Despatches of Lord Whitworth and others. Edited by Oscar Browning, M.A.

Walter of Henley's Husbandry, together with an Anonymous Husbandry, Seneschaucie, and Robert Grosseteste's Rules. Edited by E. Lamond and W. Cunningham, D.D. Litt.D.

Domesday Commemoration, 1886. Notes on the Manuscripts, &c., exhibited at H.M. Public Record Office. Vellum, 4to.

Gibbon Commemoration, 1894, Proceedings of the. Vellum, 4to.

The Story of Prince Henry of Monmouth and Chief-Justice Gascoign. By F. Solly-Flood, M.A., Q.C.

The Teaching of History in Schools: an Address by Oscar Browning, M.A. V.-P. R.Hist.S.

Genealogical Memoirs of the Scottish House of Christie.

Genealogical Memoirs of John Knox and of the Family of Kno

Genealogical Memoirs of the Families of Colt and Coutts.

Genealogical Memoirs of the Family of Sir Walter Scott, Bart. With a reprint of his Memorials of the Haliburtons.

*** *Applications for any of the above should be addressed to the Librarian,* Mr. T. MASON, 115 *St. Martin's Lane, W.C.*

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CAMDEN SOCIETY.

NOW THE CAMDEN SERIES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

NEW SERIES.

1. The Fortescue Papers, principally consisting of letters on State affairs, collected by John Packer, Secretary to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, Esq. LL.D. Director. Consists chiefly of a miscellaneous collection of letters which were apparently thrown aside by the Duke of Buckingham after he had read them. One paper is of peculiar importance as relating to Raleigh's trial.

2. Letters and Papers of John Shillingford, Mayor of Exeter, A.D., 1447–1450. Edited by Stuart A. Moore, Esq. Valuable as throwing light on the practical working of our institutions and the administration of the law in the reign of Henry VI.

3. The Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal from the Reign of Elizabeth to the Accession of the House of Hanover. Edited by Dr. Rimbault. Full of notices of English Musicians connected with the Chapel, and of minute particulars of royal ceremonies, funerals, coronations, churchings, baptisms, marriages, &c.

4. A True Relation of the Life and Death of William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore. Edited by Thomas Wharton Jones, Esq. F.R.S. Interesting not only for the light it throws on the working of the Church of Ireland at a most important period in its history, but also for the personal character of Bishop Bedell himself.

5. The Mayor of Bristol's Calendar, by Robert Ricart, Town Clerk of Bristol temp. Edward IV. Edited by Miss Toulmin Smith. Illustrative of municipal antiquities.

6. Notes of Debates in the House of Commons in 1625. Edited from a MS. in the Library of Sir Rainald Knightley, Bart., by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. LL.D. Director. Throws additional light on the quarrel between Charles I. and the House of Commons, and contains new facts relating to Sir John Eliot.

7. A Military Memoir of Colonel Birch, Governor of Hereford during the Civil War. Edited by the late Rev. John Webb, M.A. F.S.A., and the Rev. T. W. Webb, M.A. A storehouse of curious facts relating to the period of the Civil War.

8 and 9. Letters addressed from London to Sir Joseph Williamson while Plenipotentiary at the Congress of Cologne in the year 1673. Edited by W. D. Christie, C.B. Two vols. Full of news from the Court of Charles II.

10. Account of the Executors of Richard, Bishop of London, 1303, and of the Executors of Thomas, Bishop of Exeter, 1310. Edited by the late Venerable W. H. Hale, M.A., and the Rev. H. T. Ellacombe, M.A. F.S.A. Full of curious details on the household and ecclesiastical furniture of a bishop of the fourteenth century.

11 and 20. Wriothesley's Chronicle of English Affairs from the accession of Henry VII. to the first year of Queen Elizabeth. Edited from a MS. in

the possession of Major.-Gen. Lord Henry Percy, by W. D. Hamilton, Esq. F.S.A. Two vols. Contains particulars not in other chronicles of the period. The Editor has printed in an Appendix to the First Volume the records of the trial of Anne Boleyn.

12. Documents relating to the Quarrel between the Earl of Manchester and Oliver Cromwell; with Fragments of a Historical Preface by the late J. Bruce, Esq. Annotated and completed by Professor Masson. Gives information about the proceedings of Manchester and Cromwell from the battle of Marston Moor till after the second battle of Newbury, and also the arguments on both sides of the dispute which ensued.

13. Autobiography of Lady Halket, in the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II. Edited by the late John Gough Nichols, Esq. F.S.A. The subject is a pious lady of the days of the Commonwealth and the Restoration.

14. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. VII., containing :—1. Two Sermons preached by the Boy-Bishop. Edited by the late J. G. Nichols. With an Introduction by Dr. Rimbault. 2. Speech of Sir Robert Heath in the case of Alexander Leighton. Edited, with a Preface by the late J. Bruce, Esq., by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. 3. Notes of Sir G. Croke's Judgment in the case of Ship Money. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. 4. Letters relating to the Mission of Sir T. Roe to Gustavus Adolphus, 1629–1630. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. 5. Accounts of the Expenditure in building Bodmin Church. Edited by the Rev. J. J. Wilkinson, M.A. Rector of Lanteglos.

15. Letters of Dean Prideaux. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson, Esq. The letters contain amusing descriptions of life at Oxford and in the country at the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

16. Milton's Common Place Book. Edited by A. J. Horwood, Esq. It is unnecessary to point out the interest of Milton's notes and jottings on a variety of subjects, political, social, moral, and literary.

17. Historical Collections of a London Citizen in the Fifteenth Century. Edited by James Gairdner, Esq. Printed from a MS. The poem is a very graphic original account of the siege of Rouen by Henry V. The chronicle is unique, ending in the middle of Edward IV.'s reign.

18. Papers relating to the Life of William Prynne, with the Fragment of a Biographical Preface by the late J. Bruce, Esq. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. LL.D. Director.

19. Christ Church Letters relating to the Priory of Christ Church, Canterbury. Edited by J. B. Sheppard, Esq. Mostly of the fifteenth century, and some of political importance, relating to embassies, &c.

21. Harpsfield's Treatise of the Pretended Divorce between Henry VIII. and Catharine of Aragon. Edited by the Rev. N. Pocock. An early authority for many facts hitherto considered questionable concerning Henry VIII.'s reign, which are now more generally accepted than they were.

22 and 23. Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, 1601–1704. Edited by E. M. Thompson, Esq. Full of news and gossip. May be taken as a fair sample of the correspondence of a family of the higher classes in the seventeenth century.

24. Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords officially taken by H. Elsing, 1624 and 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, Esq.

25. The Œconomy of the Fleete. Edited by Dr. A. Jessopp. An account of the state of the Fleet Prison in the time of James I.

26. Documents relating to St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. F.S.A. Ranging from the thirteenth to the beginning of the eighteenth century.

27. The Hamilton Papers, 1638–1648. Edited from the Originals at Hamilton Palace by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. Important for the history both of England and of Scotland during that troubled period.

28. Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles. Edited by James Gairdner, Esq.

29. The Puritan Visitation of the University of Oxford. Edited by Professor Montagu Burrows, F.S.A.

30. Catholicon Anglicum. Edited by Sidney J. Herrtage, Esq. A mediæval Latin Glossary of great interest from a philological point of view.

31. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. VIII., containing:—Four letters of the Earl of Strafford, and a Poem on his illness. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. LL.D. Director. Memoir by Madame de Motteville on the Life of Henrietta Maria. Edited by M. G. Hanotaux. Papers relating to the Delinquency of Thomas Viscount Savile, 1642-1646; Five Letters from Richard Thompson to his brother Henry Thompson, of Escrick, afterwards M.P. for York. Edited by J. J. Cartwright, Esq. M.A. Treasurer. Papers relating to Secret Negotiations with Charles I. 1643-1644. Edited by Mrs. B. M. Gardiner. A Letter from the Earl of Manchester on the conduct of Cromwell; Letters addressed to the Earl of Lauderdale. Edited by Osmund Airy, Esq. Letters of the Duke of Monmouth. Edited by Sir George Duckett, Bart. Correspondence of the Family of Haddock, 1657-1719. Edited by Edward Maunde Thompson, Esq.

32. The Voyage to Cadiz in 1625. Edited by Dr. Grosart.

33. Diary and Letter Book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573-1580. Edited by Edward J. L. Scott, Esq. M.A. Throws light upon university life at Cambridge in the age of Elizabeth.

34, 36, and 38. Selections from the Papers of the Duke of Lauderdale, temp. Car. II. Edited by Osmund Airy, Esq. Three Volumes. Vol. I. 1639–1667. Vol. II. 1667-1673. Vol. III. 1673-1679. Illustrative of the period of the Restoration in Scotland.

35. Political Memoranda of the Fifth Duke of Leeds. Edited by Oscar Browning, Esq. M.A.

37. Papers relating to issue of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Edited by the Rev. N. Pocock.

39. Proceedings in the Star Chamber and Court of High Commission in the year 1632. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. LL.D. Director.

40. The Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State, and of his son Sir John Nicholas, Clerk to the Privy Council, Vol. I. Edited by George F. Warner, Esq. M.A. Supplementary to correspondence printed in Evelyn's Diary, with matter relating to the Court of Charles II. during his exile.

41. Custumals of Battle Abbey, temp. Edward I., from a Manuscript in the Public Record Office. Edited by Samuel R. Scargill Bird, Esq. F.S.A. Throws light on the tenure of land and manorial customs in the thirteenth century.

42 and 44. Bishop Pococke's Travels in England in 1750, &c. Two Vols. Edited by James J. Cartwright, Esq. M.A. Treasurer of the Society.

43. Monastic Visitations in the Diocese of Norwich. Edited by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D.D. These visitations show the state of monastic life in the diocese of Norwich on the eve of the Reformation.

45. Papers relating to the Impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham in 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, Esq. LL.D. Director.

46. Memoirs relating to Lord Torrington. Edited by John Knox Laughton, Esq. M.A. R.N. Illustrative of naval affairs in the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

47. Essex Papers, Vol. I. Edited by Osmund Airy, Esq. Contains new matter relating to the Court of Charles II. and to the government of Ireland in his reign.

48. Visitations of the Collegiate Church of Southwell. Edited by A. F. Leach, Esq. A set of visitations differing in character from those in No. 43, and most important to a complete study of clerical life in pre-Reformation times.

49. The Clarke MSS. Vol. I. Edited by C. H. Firth, Esq. More important for the life of Cromwell than any book published since the well-known work of Carlyle.

50. Nicholas Papers, Vol. II. *See* No. 40.

51. Accounts of the Obedientiars of Abingdon Abbey. Edited by R. E. G. KIRK, Esq.

52. Wardrobe Accounts of Henry Earl of Derby (afterwards Henry IV.). Edited by Miss Toulmin Smith, with the co-operation of the Historical Society of East Prussia.

53. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. IX., containing:—1. Visitations of Churches in the Patronage of St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. 2. "The Spousells" of the Princess Mary, daughter of Henry VII., in 1508. Edited by James Gairdner, Esq. Secretary. 3. Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council in 1564. Edited by Miss Mary Bateson. 4. Papers relating to Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford. Edited by C. H. Firth, Esq. M.A. 5. Hamilton Papers, Addenda. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, Esq. LL.D. Director. 6. Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe. Edited by the Rev. Andrew Clark. 7. The Journal of Major Richard Ferrier, M.P., during a tour in France in 1687. Edited by Richard F. E. and John A. H. Ferrier, Esqs.

54. The Clarke Papers. Vol. II. Edited by C. H. Firth, Esq. M.A.

55. Visitations of Churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral in 1297 and in 1458. Edited by W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. F.S.A.

56. Unpublished Papers relating to English Roman Catholics at the end of the Reign of Elizabeth. Vol. I. Edited by T. G. Law, Esq.

57. Nicholas Papers. Vol. III. *See* No. 40.

OLD SERIES.

Volumes not included in this List are out of Print.

8. Ecclesiastical Documents: viz.—1. A Brief History of the Bishoprick of Somerset from its Foundation to 1174. 2. Charters from the Library of Dr. Cox Macro. Published by the Rev. J. Hunter.

9. Speculi Britanniæ Pars: an historical and geographical Description of Essex, by John Norden, 1594. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

11. Kemp's Nine Daies Wonder, performed in a Daunce from London to Norwich. Edited by Rev. A. Dyce.

14. Narratives of the Contests in Ireland in 1641 and 1690. Edited by T. C. Croker.

17. The Second Book of the Travels of Nicander Nucius, of Corcyra. Edited by Rev. J. A. Cramer.

18. Three Early English Metrical Romances. Edited by J. Robson.

19. The Private Diary of Dr. John Dee, and the Catalogue of his Library of Manuscripts. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

21. Rutland Papers. Original Documents illustrative of the Courts and Times of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Edited by W. Jerdan.

22. The Diary of Dr. Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, from August 1686 to October 1687. Printed from the original MS. of the Rev. J. Hunter.

23. Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

24. A contemporary Narrative of the Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler, prosecuted for Sorcery in 1324, by Richard de Ledrede, Bishop of Ossory. Edited by T. Wright.

25 [54 and 89]. Promptorium Parvulorum sive Clericorum, Lexicon Anglo-Latinum Princeps, auctore fratre Galfrido Grammatico dicto, e Predicatoribus Lenne Episcopi, Northfolciensi, A.D. circa 1440. Edited by A. Way. Part I. and Part III. (Nos. 25 and 89) out of print.

27. Correspondence of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leycester, 1585 and 1586. Edited by J. Bruce.

28. The French Chronicle of London. Depuis l'an 44 Hen. III. jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw. III. Edited by G. J. Aungier.

29. Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, comprising the Reigns of Henry VI., Edward IV., and Richard III. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

30. The Thornton Romances. The Early English Metrical Romances of Perceval, Isumbras, Eglamour, and Degravant. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

31. Verney Papers. Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, temp. Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce.

32. The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B., of Skreens, in the Hundred of Chelmsford. Printed from the MS. of T. W. Bramston.

33. Letters from James, Earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, &c., to his Sister the Countess of Erroll, and other members of his Family. Edited by W. Jerdan.

34. De Antiquis Legibus Liber. Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum, 1178 to 1274. By T. Stapleton.

35. The Chronicle of Calais, in the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII., to 1540. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

36. Polydore Vergil's English History, prior to the Norman Conquest. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

37. A Relation, or rather a True Account, of the Isle of England, about 1500. Translated from the Italian by Charlotte Augusta Sneyd.

38. Documents relative to the Foundation and Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Middleham, Co. York, and notices of the Castle and Town. Edited by Rev. W. Atthill.

39. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. I. :—1. Register and Chronicle of the Abbey of Aberconway. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 2. Chronicle of the Rebellion in

Lincolnshire, 1470. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 3. Bull of Pope Innocent VIII., on the Marriage of Henry VII. with Elizabeth of York. Communicated by J. P. Collier. 4. Journal of the Siege of Rouen, 1591. By Sir T. Coningsby. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Letter from George Fleetwood to his Father, giving an account of the Battle of Lutzen. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart. 6. Diary of Dr. Edward Lake, Archdeacon and Prebendary of Exeter, &c., in 1677 and 1678. Edited by G. P. Elliott.

40. A Commentary of the Services and Charges of William Lord Grey of Wilton, by his son Arthur Lord Grey of Wilton. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart.

41. Diary of Walter Yonge, Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton. 1604 to 1628. Edited by G. Roberts.

42. The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London, from 1550 to 1563. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

43. The Visitation of the County of Huntingdon under the authority of William Camden, Clarenceux King of Arms, 1613. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

44. The Obituary of Richard Smyth, Secondary of the Poultry Compter, London. 1627 to 1674. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

45. Certaine Considerations upon the Government of England. By Sir Roger Twysden, Kt. and Bart. Edited by J. M. Kemble.

46. Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI. of Scotland. Edited by J. Bruce.

47. Chronicon Petroburgense. Edited by T. Stapleton.

48. The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and two years of Queen Mary. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

49. Wills and Inventories, from the Registers of the Commissary of Bury St. Edmund's and the Archdeacon of Sudbury. Edited by S. Tymms.

50. Gualteri Mapes de Nugis Curialium Distinctiones quinque. Edited by T. Wright.

51. The Pylgrymage of Sir Richard Guylforde to the Holy Land, 1506. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

52. Moneys received and paid for Secret Services of Charles II. and James II. 1679 to 1688. Edited by J. Y. Akerman.

56. Letters and Papers of the Verney Family, to the end of 1639. Edited by J. Bruce.

58. Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley. Edited by T. T. Lewis.

59 and 62. Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, Bishop of Hereford, 1289-90.

60. Grants, &c., from the Crown during the reign of Edward V. and two Speeches for opening Parliament, by John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, Lord Chancellor. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

61. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. III. :—1. Papers relating to Proceedings in Co. Kent, 1642-1646. Edited by R. Almack. 2. Ancient Biographical Poems, on the Duke of Norfolk, Viscount Hereford, the Earl of Essex, and Queen Elizabeth. Edited by J. P. Collier. 3. A Relation of some Abuses which are committed against the Common-Wealth, 1629. Edited by Sir F. Madden, K.H. 4. Inventories of the Wardrobes, &c., of Henry FitzRoy, Duke of Richmond. And of Katherine, Princess Dowager at Baynard's Castle. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

62. (See No. 59.)

63. Letters of Charles I. to Queen Henrietta Maria. Edited by J. Bruce.

64. An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI. Edited by Rev. J. S. Davies, M.A.

65. The Knights Hospitallers of England, 1338. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking, M.A.

66. Diary of John Rous, Incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green.

67. Trevelyan Papers prior to 1558. Edited by J. P. Collier. *See also* Nos. 84 and 105.

68. Journal of the Very Rev. Rowland Davies, LL.D. Dean of Ross, 1688–1690. Edited by R. Caulfield, B.A.

69. The Domesday of St. Paul's, 1222; or Registrum de Visitatione Maneriorum per Robertum Decanum, &c. Edited by W. H. Hale.

70. Liber Famelicus of James Whitelocke, a Judge of the King's Bench in the reigns of James I. and Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce.

71. Savile Correspondence. Temp. Charles II. and James II. Edited by W. D. Cooper.

72. The Romance of Blonde of Oxford and Jehan of Dammartin. By Philippe de Reimes, a Trouvère of the Thirteenth Century. Edited by M. Le Roux de Lincy.

73. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. IV.:—1. A London Chronicle during the Reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Edited by C. Hopper. 2. The Expenses of the Judges of Assize riding in the Western and Oxford Circuits, 1596–1601. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 3. The Skryvener's Play, The Incredulity of St. Thomas. Edited by J. P. Collier. 4. The Childe of Bristowe, a Poem by John Lydgate. Edited by C. Hopper. 5. Sir Edw. Lake's Account of his Interviews with Charles I. on being created a Baronet. Edited by T. P. Langmead. 6. The Letters of Pope to Atterbury, when in the Tower of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 7. Supplementary Note to the Discovery of the Jesuits' College in March, 1627–8. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

74. Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army during the great Civil War, kept by Ric. Symonds. Edited by C. E. Long.

75. Original Papers illustrative of the Life and Writings of John Milton. Edited by W. D. Hamilton.

76. Letters of George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, Ambassador to the Court of the Great Mogul, 1615–1617. Edited by J. Maclean.

77. Narratives of the Days of the Reformation. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

78. Correspondence of James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England, temp. Elizabeth. Edited by J. Bruce.

79. Letters written by John Chamberlain during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Sarah Williams.

80. Proceedings, principally in Co. Kent, in connection with the Parliaments called in 1640. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking.

81. Parliamentary Debates in 1610. Edited by S. R. Gardiner.

82. Lists of Foreign Protestants, and Aliens, resident in England, 1618–1688. Edited by W. D. Cooper.

83. Wills from Doctors' Commons, 1495–1695. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

84. Trevelyan Papers. Part II. 1446–1643. Edited by J. P. Collier. *See* Nos. 67 and 105.

85. The Life of Marmaduke Rawdon of York. Edited by R. Davies.

86. Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckington, and others. Temp. Henry V. and Henry VI. Edited by C. Monro.

87. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. V.:—1. Five Letters of Charles II. Communicated by the Marquis of Bristol. 2. Letter of the Council to Sir Thomas Lake. 3. Documents relating to Sir Walter Raleigh's last voyage. Communicated by S. R. Gardiner. 4. A Catalogue of Early English Miscellanies formerly in the Harleian Library. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 5. Letters selected from the collection of Autographs in the possession of William Tite, Esq. 6. Sir Francis Drake's Memorable Service done against the Spaniards in 1587. By Robert Leng, one of his co-adventurers. Edited by C. Hopper. 7. Inquiry into the Genuineness of a Letter dated February 3rd, 1613, signed "Mary Magdaline Davers."

88. Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew. Edited by J. Maclean.

90. Letters and other Documents illustrating the Relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. (*See also* 98.)

91. Registrum sive Liber Irrotularius et Consuetudinarius Prioratus Beatæ Mariæ Wigorniensis. By W. H. Hale.

92. Pope Alexander VII. and the College of Cardinals. By John Bargrave, D.D. Edited by J. C. Robertson.

93. Accounts and Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots. Edited by A. J. Crosby and J. Bruce.

94 and 97. History from Marble. Compiled in the Reign of Charles II. by Thomas Dingley. Printed in Photolithography by Vincent Brooks. Edited by J. G. Nichols. Some copies of Vol. II.

95. Manipulus Vocabulorum. A Dictionary of English and Latin words, by Peter Levins, 1570. Edited by H. B. Wheatley.

96. Journal of a Voyage into the Mediterranean, by Sir Kenelm Digby, 1628. Edited by J. Bruce.

97. (*See* No. 94.)

98. Letters and other Documents illustrating the relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Second series. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. (*See* 90.)

99. Diary of John Manningham. 1602–3. Edited by J. Bruce.

100. Notes of the Treaty carried on at Ripon between Charles I. and the Covenanters of Scotland, 1640, taken by Sir John Borough, Garter King of Arms. Edited by J. Bruce.

101. El hecho de los Tratados del Matrimonio pretendido por el Principe de Gales con la serenissima Infanta de España Maria, &c. Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty. Edited and translated by S. R. Gardiner.

102. Churchwarden's Accounts of the Town of Ludlow, in Shropshire, from 1540 to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by T. Wright.

103. Notes of the Debates of the House of Lords. By Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliament, 1621. Edited by S. R. Gardiner.

104. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. VI.:—1. Life of William Whittingham, Dean of Durham. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green. 2. The Earl of Bristol's

Defence of his Negotiations in Spain. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 3. Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham, December, 1570, to April, 1583. Edited by C. T. Martin.

105. Trevelyan Papers. Part III. Edited by Sir Walter and Sir Charles Trevelyan. *See* Nos. 67 and 84.

*** *Applications for any of the above should be addressed to the Librarian,* Mr. T. MASON, 115 *St. Martin's Lane, W.C.*

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

DA
20
R9
n.s.
v.11

Royal Historical Society,
London
Transactions

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

Circulate as monograph